arXiv:1108.2828v1 [math.NA] 13 Aug 2011

COMPLEXITY OF PATH-FOLLOWING METHODS FOR THE EIGENVALUE PROBLEM

DIEGO ARMENTANO

Abstract. In this paper we study path-following methods for the eigenvalue problem. We introduce a projective framework to analyze this problem. We define a condition number and a Newton's map appropriate for this context, proving a version of the γ-Theorem. Our main result bounds the complexity of path-following methods in terms of the length of the path in the condition metric.

1. Introduction And Main Results

1.1. **Introduction.** In this paper we study the complexity of path-following methods to solve the eigenvalue problem:

$$(\lambda I_n - A)v = 0, \quad v \neq 0,$$

where $A \in \mathbb{K}^{n\times n}$ ($\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{C}$), $v \in \mathbb{K}^n$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{K}$. Classical algorithms for solving the eigenvalue problem may be divided into two classes: QR methods (including Hessenberg reduction, single or double shift strategy, deflation), and Krylov subspace methods; see Wilkinson [22], Golub-van Loan [13], Stewart [19], Watkins [21].

Surprisingly, the complexity of the eigenvalue problem is still an open problem. It may be formulated in the following terms: given an algorithm designed to solve the eigenvalue problem,

1. For which class of matrices does it converge ?
2. What is the average number of steps, in a given probabilistic model on the set of inputs, to obtain a given accuracy on the output ?

The two following examples show that such questions are particularly difficult:

- QR algorithm with Wilkinson's single shift diverges for a non-empty open set of matrices (see Batterson-Smillie [1, 2]).
- QR algorithm is convergent for almost every complex matrix. However, even for the choice of *Gaussian Orthogonal Ensamble*, as a probabilistic model, question (2) remains unanswered (see Deift [10]).

In this paper we consider the eigenvalue problem as a bilinear polynomial system of equations and we consider homotopy methods to solve it. The system $(\lambda I_n - A)v = 0$, $v \neq 0$, is the endpoint of a path of problems

$$(\lambda(t)I_n - A(t))v(t) = 0, \; v(t) \neq 0, \; 0 \leq t \leq 1,$$

with $(A(1), \lambda(1), v(1)) = (A, \lambda, v)$. Starting from a known triple $(A(0), \lambda(0), v(0))$ we "follow" this path to reach the target system $(\lambda I_n - A)v = 0$. The algorithmic

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 65H17, 65H20.

Key words and phrases. Eigenvalue problem, homotopy methods, multihomogenous polynomial systems, approximate zero, complexity, condition metric.

way to do so is to construct a finite number of triples

$$(A_k, \lambda_k, v_k),\ 0 \le k \le K,$$

with $A_k = A(t_k)$, and $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \ldots < t_K = 1$, and where λ_k, v_k are approximations of $\lambda(t_k)$, $v(t_k)$. The complexity of this algorithm (defined more precisely below) is measured by the number K of steps sufficient to validate this approximation. In this paper we relate K with a geometric invariant, namely, the **condition length** of the path.

We begin with the geometric framework of our problem. Since the eigenvalue problem is homogeneous in $v \in \mathbb{K}^n$ and in $(A, \lambda) \in \mathbb{K}^{n\times n} \times \mathbb{K}$, we define the solution variety as

$$\mathcal{V} =: \left\{(A, \lambda, v) \in \mathbb{P}\left(\mathbb{K}^{n\times n} \times \mathbb{K}\right) \times \mathbb{P}\left(\mathbb{K}^n\right) :\ (\lambda I_n - A)v = 0\right\},$$

where $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})$ denotes the projective space associated with the vector space $\mathbb{E}$. We speak interchangeably of a non zero vector and its corresponding class in the projective space.

1.2. A bihomogeneous Newton's method.

Given a non-zero matrix $A \in \mathbb{K}^{n\times n}$, we define the evaluation map $F_A : \mathbb{K} \times \mathbb{K}^n \to \mathbb{K}^n$, by

$$F_A(\lambda, v) := (\lambda I_n - A)v.$$

Associated to F_A we define $N_A : \mathbb{K} \times (\mathbb{K}^n - \{0\}) \to \mathbb{K} \times \mathbb{K}^n$, given by

$$N_A(\lambda, v) := (\lambda, v) - \left(DF_A(\lambda, v)|_{\mathbb{K}\times v^\perp}\right)^{-1} F_A(\lambda, v), \tag{1.1}$$

defined for all (λ, v) such that $DF_A(\lambda, v)|_{\mathbb{K}\times v^\perp}$ is surjective. Here $v^\perp$ is the Hermitian complement of v in $\mathbb{K}^n$. This map is homogeneous of degree 1 in v, therefore, N_A induces a map from $\mathbb{K} \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^n)$ into itself.

We define the *Newton map* N on $(\mathbb{K}^{n\times n} - \{0_n\}) \times \mathbb{K} \times (\mathbb{K}^n - \{0\})$ by

$$N(A, \lambda, v) := \big(A, N_A(\lambda, v)\big).$$

This map N is a bihomogeneous map of degree 1 in (A, λ) and v. Hence N is well-defined on $\mathbb{P}\big(\mathbb{K}^{n\times n} \times \mathbb{K}\big) \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^n)$ (see *Section 4*).

Given $A \in \mathbb{K}^{n\times n}$, $A \neq 0_n$, and $(\lambda_0, v_0) \in \mathbb{K} \times \mathbb{K}^n$, $v_0 \neq 0$, the *Newton sequence* associated to A is defined by

$$(A, \lambda_{k+1}, v_{k+1}) := N(A, \lambda_k, v_k), \quad k \ge 0.$$

We say that this sequence *converges immediately quadratically* to a solution of the eigenvalue problem $(A, \lambda, v) \in \mathcal{V}$ when

$$d_{\mathbb{P}^2}\left((A, \lambda_k, v_k), (A, \lambda, v)\right) \le \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{2^k-1} \cdot d_{\mathbb{P}^2}\left((A, \lambda_0, v_0), (A, \lambda, v)\right),$$

for all positive integer k. Here $d_{\mathbb{P}^2}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the induced Riemannian distance on $\mathbb{P}\big(\mathbb{K}^{n\times n} \times \mathbb{K}\big) \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^n)$ (see *Section 2.1*). In that case we say that (A, λ_0, v_0) is an *approximate solution* of the eigenvalue problem $(A, \lambda, v) \in \mathcal{V}$.

1.3. **The predictor-corrector algorithm.** Let $\Gamma(t) = (A(t), \lambda(t), v(t))$, $a \leq t \leq b$, be a representative path in $\mathcal{V}$. To approximate the path Γ by a finite sequence we use the following predictor-corrector strategy: given a mesh $a = t_0 < t_1 < \ldots < t_K = b$ and a triple $(A(t_0), \lambda_0, v_0) \in \mathbb{K}^{n\times n} \times \mathbb{K} \times \mathbb{K}^n$, $(v_0 \neq 0)$, we define

$$(A(t_{k+1}), \lambda_{k+1}, v_{k+1}) := N(A(t_{k+1}), \lambda_k, v_k), \quad 0 \leq k \leq K-1,$$

(in case the Newton map is defined). We say that the sequence $(A(t_k), \lambda_k, v_k)$, $0 \leq k \leq K$, *approximates* the path $\Gamma(t)$, $a \leq t \leq b$, when, for any $k = 0, \ldots, K$, $(A(t_k), \lambda_k, v_k)$ is an approximate solution of the eigentriple $\Gamma(t_k) = (A(t_k), \lambda(t_k), v(t_k)) \in \mathcal{V}$. In that case we define the *complexity of the sequence* by K.

1.4. **Condition of a triple and condition length.** Let $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathcal{V}$ be the set of *well-posed* problems, that is the set of triples $(A, \lambda, v) \in \mathcal{V}$ such that λ is a simple eigenvalue (see *Section 3*). In that case, for a fixed representative $(A, \lambda, v) \in \mathcal{V}$, the operator $\Pi_{v^\perp}(\lambda I_n - A)|_{v^\perp}$ is invertible, where $\Pi_{v^\perp}$ denotes the orthogonal projection of $\mathbb{K}^n$ onto $v^\perp$. The condition number of (A, λ, v) is defined by

$$\mu(A, \lambda, v) := \max\left\{1, \|A\|_F \cdot \|\Pi_{v^\perp}(\lambda I_n - A)|_{v^\perp}{}^{-1}\|\right\}, \tag{1.2}$$

where $\|\cdot\|_F$ and $\|\cdot\|$ are the Frobenius and operator norms in the space of matrices. We also let $\mu(A, \lambda, v) = \infty$ when $(A, \lambda, v) \in \mathcal{V} - \mathcal{W}$; (see *Section 3*).

When $\Gamma(t)$, $a \leq t \leq b$, is an absolutely continuous path in $\mathcal{W}$, we define its *condition-length* as

$$\ell_\mu(\Gamma) := \int_a^b \left\|\dot{\Gamma}(t)\right\|_{\Gamma(t)} \cdot \mu\left(\Gamma(t)\right)\, dt, \tag{1.3}$$

where $\left\|\dot{\Gamma}(t)\right\|_{\Gamma(t)}$ is the norm of $\dot{\Gamma}(t)$ in the unitarily invariant Riemannian structure on $\mathcal{V}$ (see *Section* 2.1).

1.5. **Main Results.** The main theorem concerning the convergence of Newton's iteration is the following.

Theorem 1. *There is a universal constant $u_0 > 0$ with the following property. Let (A, λ, v), $(A, \lambda_0, v_0) \in \mathbb{P}\big(\mathbb{K}^{n\times n} \times \mathbb{K}\big) \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^n)$. If $(A, \lambda, v) \in \mathcal{W}$ and*

$$d_{\mathbb{P}^2}\left((A, \lambda_0, v_0), (A, \lambda, v)\right) < \frac{u_0}{\mu(A, \lambda, v)},$$

then, (A, λ_0, v_0) is an approximate solution of (A, λ, v).
(One may choose $u_0 = 0.0739$).

Theorem 1 is a version of the so called *γ-theorem* (see Blum et al. [4]), which gives the size of the basin of attraction of Newton's method. Different versions of the γ-theorem for the symmetric eigenvalue problem and for the generalized eigenvalue problem are given in Dedieu [7] and Dedieu-Shub [9] respectively.

Theorem 1 is the main ingredient to prove complexity results for path-following methods.

The proof of *Theorem 1* follows from a version of the γ-theorem for the map $N_A : \mathbb{K} \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^n) \to \mathbb{K} \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^n)$ which is interesting in itself (see *Section 4*).

Following these lines our main result is:

Theorem 2. *There is a universal constant* $C > 0$ *such that for any absolutely continuous path* Γ *in* $\mathcal{W}$*, there exists a sequence which approximates* Γ*, and such that the complexity of the sequence is*

$$K \leq C\,\ell_\mu(\Gamma) + 1.$$

(One may choose $C = 120$*).*

The proof of *Theorem 2* is given in *Section 5.*

1.6. Comments.

In their seminal paper [17], Shub and Smale relate, in the context of polynomial system solving, the complexity K to three ingredients: the degree of the considered system, the length of the path $\Gamma(t)$, and the condition number of the path. Precisely, they obtain the complexity

$$K \leq CD^{3/2}\ell(\Gamma)\mu(\Gamma)^2),$$

where C is a universal constant, D is the degree of the system, $\ell(\Gamma)$ is the length of Γ in the associated Riemannian structure, and $\mu(\Gamma) = \sup_{a \leq t \leq b} \mu\left(\Gamma(t)\right)$. Similar results for the generalized eigenvalue problem were obtained in Dedieu-Shub [9].

In Shub [16] the complexity K of path-following methods for the polynomial system solving problem is analyzed in terms of the condition length of the path.

In the context of polynomial system solving, the eigenvalue problem may be considered as a quadratic system of equations. However, [17] and [16] do not apply since the eigenvalue problem as a quadratic system belongs to the subset of ill-posed problems of generic quadratic systems. (See Li [14]). Therefore, in order to analyze the complexity of the eigenvalue problem, a different framework is required. Here we consider the eigenvalue problem as a bilinear problem (see *Subsection 2.2.1*).

The approach considered in this paper is greatly inspired by Shub [16].

Remark 1.1. Our next objective is to transfer these theoretical considerations into a practical algorithm. This issue will be considered in another paper. For the case of polynomial system solving see Beltrán [3], Bürgisser-Cucker [5], Dedieu-Malajovich-Shub [8].

Note: Throughout this paper we will work with $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$. However most definitions and results can be extended immediately to the case $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$. Whenever it is necessary we shall state the difference.

2. Riemannian Structures and the Solution Variety

In this section we define the canonical metric structures and study some basic topological and algebraic properties of the solution variety.

2.1. Canonical Metric Structures.

The space $\mathbb{K}^n$ is equipped with the canonical Hermitian inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$. The space $\mathbb{K}^{n\times n}$ is equipped with the Frobenius Hermitian inner product

$$\langle A, B \rangle_F := \text{trace } (B^* A),$$

where B^* denotes the adjoint of B.

In general, if $\mathbb{E}$ is a finite dimensional vector space over $\mathbb{K}$ with the Hermitian inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$, we can define an Hermitian structure over $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})$ in the following way: for $x \in \mathbb{E}$,

$$\langle w, w' \rangle_x := \frac{\langle w, w' \rangle}{\|x\|^2},$$

for all w, w' in the Hermitian complement $x^{\perp}$ of x in $\mathbb{E}$, which is a natural representative of the tangent space $T_x\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})$. Let $d_{\mathbb{P}}(x,y)$ be the angle between the vectors x and y.

In this way, the space $\mathbb{P}\big(\mathbb{K}^{n\times n}\times\mathbb{K}\big)\times\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^n)$ inherits the Hermitian product structure

$$\|(\dot{A},\dot{\lambda},\dot{v})\|^2_{(A,\lambda,v)} = \|(\dot{A},\dot{\lambda})\|^2_{(A,\lambda)} + \|\dot{v}\|^2_v \tag{2.1}$$

for all $(\dot{A},\dot{\lambda},\dot{v}) \in (A,\lambda)^{\perp}\times v^{\perp}$.

We denote by $d_{\mathbb{P}^2}(\cdot,\cdot)$ the induced Riemannian distance on $\mathbb{P}\big(\mathbb{K}^{n\times n}\times\mathbb{K}\big)\times\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^n)$.

Throughout this paper we denote by the same symbol $d_{\mathbb{P}}$ distances over $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^n)$, $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^{n\times n})$ and $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^{n\times n}\times\mathbb{K})$.

2.2. **The Solution Variety $\mathcal{V}$.** Recall that the solution variety $\mathcal{V}\subset\mathbb{P}\big(\mathbb{K}^{n\times n}\times\mathbb{K}\big)\times\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^n)$ is given by the set of triples (A,λ,v) such that $(\lambda I_n - A)v = 0$. Note that $\mathcal{V}$ is the set of equivalence classes of the set $\{F=0\}$, where $F:\mathbb{K}^{n\times n}\times\mathbb{K}\times(\mathbb{K}^n-\{0\})\to\mathbb{K}^n$ is the multihomogenous system of polynomials given by

$$F(A,\lambda,v) = (\lambda I_n - A)v. \tag{2.2}$$

Therefore $\mathcal{V}$ is an algebraic subvariety of the product $\mathbb{P}\big(\mathbb{K}^{n\times n}\times\mathbb{K}\big)\times\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^n)$. Moreover, since 0 is a regular value of F, we conclude that $\mathcal{V}$ is also a smooth submanifold of $\mathbb{P}\big(\mathbb{K}^{n\times n}\times\mathbb{K}\big)\times\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^n)$. Its dimension over $\mathbb{K}$ is given by

$$\dim\mathcal{V} = \dim(\mathbb{K}^{n\times n}\times\mathbb{K}\times\mathbb{K}^n) - n - 2 = n^2 - 1.$$

The tangent space $T_{(A,\lambda,v)}\mathcal{V}$ to $\mathcal{V}$ at (A,λ,v) is the set of triples

$$(\dot{A},\dot{\lambda},\dot{v})\in\mathbb{K}^{n\times n}\times\mathbb{K}\times\mathbb{K}^n,$$

satisfying

$$(\dot{\lambda}I_n - \dot{A})v + (\lambda I_n - A)\dot{v} = 0; \quad \langle\dot{A},A\rangle_F + \dot{\lambda}\overline{\lambda} = 0; \quad \langle\dot{v},v\rangle = 0. \tag{2.3}$$

Remark 2.1. The solution variety $\mathcal{V}$ inherits the Hermitian structure from $\mathbb{P}\big(\mathbb{K}^{n\times n}\times\mathbb{K}\big)\times\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^n)$ defined in (2.1).

We denote by π_1 and π_2 the restriction to $\mathcal{V}$ of the canoncial projections onto $\mathbb{P}\big(\mathbb{K}^{n\times n}\times\mathbb{K}\big)$ and $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^n)$ respectively.

Note that $\pi_1(\mathcal{V})\subset\mathbb{P}\big(\mathbb{K}^{n\times n}\times\mathbb{K}\big)$ does not include the pair $(0_n,1)$. Therefore we can define the map

$$\pi:\mathcal{V}\to\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^{n\times n}), \quad \pi := p\circ\pi_1,$$

where p is the canonical projection

$$p:\mathbb{P}\big(\mathbb{K}^{n\times n}\times\mathbb{K}\big)-\{(0_n,1)\}\to\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^{n\times n}), \quad p(A,\lambda) = A. \tag{2.4}$$

$$\begin{tikzcd}
& \mathcal{V} \arrow[dl, "\pi_1"'] \arrow[dr, "\pi_2"] \arrow[dd, "\pi"'] & \\
\mathbb{P}\big(\mathbb{K}^{n\times n}\times\mathbb{K}\big)-\{(0_n,1)\} \arrow[dr, "p"] & & \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^n) \\
& \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^{n\times n}) &
\end{tikzcd}$$

The derivative

$$D\pi(A,\lambda,v):T_{(A,\lambda,v)}\mathcal{V}\to T_A\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^{n\times n}), \tag{2.5}$$

is a linear operator between spaces of equal dimension.

Definition 1. We say that the triple $(A,\lambda,v)\in\mathcal{V}$ is *well-posed* when $D\pi(A,\lambda,v)$ is an isomorphism. Let $\mathcal{W}$ be the set of well-posed triples, and $\Sigma':=\mathcal{V}-\mathcal{W}$ be the *ill-posed variety.* Let $\Sigma=\pi(\Sigma')\subset\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^{n\times n})$ be the *discriminant variety*, i.e. the subset of ill-posed inputs.

Lemma 2.1. *Σ' is the set of triples $(A,\lambda,v)\in\mathcal{V}$ such that λ is not a simple eigenvalue.*

Proof. The linear operator (2.5) is given by

$$D\pi(A,\lambda,v)(\dot A,\dot\lambda,\dot v)=\dot A+\frac{\dot\lambda\cdot\overline{\lambda}}{\|A\|_F^2}\cdot A,\qquad(\dot A,\dot\lambda,\dot v)\in T_{(A,\lambda,v)}\mathcal{V}.$$

According to (2.3), a non-trivial triple in the kernel of $D\pi(A,\lambda,v)$ has the form $(\frac{-\dot\lambda\cdot\overline{\lambda}}{\|A\|_F^2}A,\dot\lambda,\dot v)$, where $\langle\dot v,v\rangle=0$, $\dot v\neq0$, and

$$\dot\lambda\left(1+\frac{|\lambda|^2}{\|A\|_F^2}\right)v+(\lambda I_n-A)\dot v=0.$$

Then, $\operatorname{rank}[(\lambda I_n-A)^2]<n-1$. □

Corollary 1. *Σ' is an algebraic subvariety of $\mathcal{V}$.*

Remark 2.2. When $\mathbb{K}=\mathbb{C}$, by the *Main Therorem of elimination theory* (cf. Mumford [15, pp. 33]) and the fact that the projection p is Zariski-closed (cf. [15, Corollary 2.28]), we conclude from *Corollary 1* that Σ is an algebraic subvariety of $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^{n\times n})$.

Remark 2.3. The solution variety $\mathcal{V}$ is connected since each $(A,\lambda,v)\in\mathcal{V}$ can be connected by a path (in $\mathcal{V}$) with a triple of the form $(vv^*,\|v\|^2,v)\in\mathcal{V}$. Here v^* is the conjugate transpose of v.

Lemma 2.2. (i) *When $\mathbb{K}=\mathbb{C}$, $\mathcal{W}$ is connected.*
(ii) *When $\mathbb{K}=\mathbb{R}$, $\mathcal{W}$ has two connected components.*

Proof. (i) Since $\mathcal{V}$ is connected, the result follows from *Corollary 1* and the fact that a complex algebraic subvariety of $\mathcal{V}$ can not disconnect it (cf. Blum et al. [4, pp. 196]).
(ii) It is enough to prove the lemma in the affine case. Let $\hat{\mathcal{V}}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{W}}$ be the affine spaces associated to $\mathcal{V}$ and $\mathcal{W}$. Let $\varphi:\hat{\mathcal{V}}\to\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ be the continuous map given by $\varphi(A,\lambda,v)=(v,\lambda I_n-A)$. Define the subsets

$$\mathcal{L}:=\{(w,M)\in\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}:\ Mw=0\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{B}:=\{(w,M)\in\mathcal{L}:\operatorname{rank}(M+ww^T)=n\}.$$

Note that φ projects $\hat{\mathcal{V}}$ onto $\mathcal{L}$, and therefore $\mathcal{L}$ is connected. Moreover $\varphi(\hat{\mathcal{W}})=\mathcal{B}$. The second assertion follows from the fact that $\Pi_{w^\perp}M|_{w^\perp}=\Pi_{w^\perp}(M+ww^T)|_{w^\perp}$, for all $(w,M)\in\mathcal{L}$.
Note that, for all $(w,M)\in\mathcal{B}$, $\varphi^{-1}(w,M)=\{(M+\alpha I_n,\alpha,w):\ \alpha\in\mathbb{R}\}$ is a one

dimensional subspace of $\hat{\mathcal{W}}$. Therefore, the set $\hat{\mathcal{B}} := \{(M, 0, w) : \ (w, M) \in \mathcal{B}\}$ is a deformation retract of $\hat{\mathcal{W}}$. It is clear that $\hat{\mathcal{B}}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ are homeomorphic.

Then, the lemma follows from the fact that $\mathcal{B}$ has two connected component on $\mathcal{L}$. □

2.2.1. *Multidegree of* $\mathcal{V}$. In this item we will see that the bilinear approach considered in this paper gives the correct number of roots of the eigenvalue problem.

For the sake of simplicity in the exposition, we will restrict ourself to the case $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$. This subsection follows closely D'Andrea-Krick-Sombra [6].

Since $\mathcal{V}$ is an algebraic subvariety of the product space $\mathbb{P}\big(\mathbb{C}^{n\times n} \times \mathbb{C}\big) \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}^n)$, there is a natural algebraic invariant associated to $\mathcal{V}$, namely, the *multidegree* of $\mathcal{V}$. This invariant is given by the numbers $\deg_{(n^2-1-i,i)}(\mathcal{V})$, $i = 0, \ldots, n-1$, where $\deg_{(n^2-1-i,i)}(\mathcal{V})$ is the number of points of intersection of $\mathcal{V}$ with the product $\Lambda \times \Lambda' \subset \mathbb{P}\big(\mathbb{C}^{n\times n} \times \mathbb{C}\big) \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}^n)$, where $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{P}\big(\mathbb{C}^{n\times n} \times \mathbb{C}\big)$ and $\Lambda' \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}^n)$ are generic $(n^2 - 1 - i)$-codimension plane and i-codimension plane respectively (see Fulton [12]).

Lemma 2.3. $\deg_{(n^2-1-i,i)}(\mathcal{V}) = \binom{n}{i+1}$ *for* $i = 0, \ldots, n-1$.

In order to give a proof of this lemma we recall some definitions from *intersection theory* (cf. Fulton [12]). (See also [6]).

The Chow ring of $\mathbb{P}\big(\mathbb{C}^{n\times n} \times \mathbb{C}\big) \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}^n)$ is the graded ring

$$\mathcal{A}^*\left(\mathbb{P}\big(\mathbb{C}^{n\times n} \times \mathbb{C}\big) \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}^n)\right) = \mathbb{Z}[\omega_1, \omega_2]/(\omega_1^{n^2+1}, \omega_2^n),$$

where ω_1 and ω_2 denotes the rational equivalence classes of the inverse images of hyperplanes of $\mathbb{P}\big(\mathbb{C}^{n\times n} \times \mathbb{C}\big)$ and $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}^n)$, under the projections $\mathbb{P}\big(\mathbb{C}^{n\times n} \times \mathbb{C}\big) \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}^n) \to \mathbb{P}\big(\mathbb{C}^{n\times n} \times \mathbb{C}\big)$ and $\mathbb{P}\big(\mathbb{C}^{n\times n} \times \mathbb{C}\big) \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}^n) \to \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}^n)$ respectively.

Given a codimension n algebraic subvariety $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{P}\big(\mathbb{C}^{n\times n} \times \mathbb{C}\big) \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}^n)$, the class of $\mathcal{X}$ in the Chow ring is

$$[\mathcal{X}] = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \deg_{(n^2-1-i,i)}(\mathcal{X})\, \omega_1^{i+1} \omega_2^{n-1-i} \in \mathcal{A}^*\left(\mathbb{P}\big(\mathbb{C}^{n\times n} \times \mathbb{C}\big) \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}^n)\right).$$

Proof of Lemma 2.3. Let F_i, $(i = 1, \ldots, n)$, be the coordinate functions of F defined in (2.2). Since F_i is bilinear for each i, we have that the class of $\{F_i = 0\} \subset \mathbb{P}\big(\mathbb{C}^{n\times n} \times \mathbb{C}\big) \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}^n)$ is given by

$$[\{F_i = 0\}] = \omega_1 + \omega_2 \in \mathcal{A}^*\left(\mathbb{P}\big(\mathbb{C}^{n\times n} \times \mathbb{C}\big) \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}^n)\right), \quad (i = 1, \ldots, n).$$

Then, the class of $\mathcal{V}$ in the Chow ring is

$$[\mathcal{V}] = [\{F_1 = 0\} \cap \cdots \cap \{F_n = 0\}] = \prod_{i=1}^{n} [\{F_i = 0\}],$$

where the last equality follows from Bézout identity. Therefore, one gets

$$[\mathcal{V}] = (\omega_1 + \omega_2)^n \equiv \sum_{\ell=1}^{n} \binom{n}{\ell} \omega_1^{\ell} \omega_2^{n-\ell},$$

that is

$$\deg_{(n^2-1-i,i)}(\mathcal{V}) = \binom{n}{i+1}.$$

□

Proposition 2.1. *For all* $A \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}^{n\times n}) - \Sigma$ *we have* $\#\pi^{-1}(A) = \deg_{(n^2-1,0)}(\mathcal{V}) = n$.

Proof. Since $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}^{n\times n}) - \Sigma$ is connected, the number of preimages under π is constant on it. From *Lemma 2.1* we get that the restriction $\pi_1|_{\mathcal{V}-\Sigma'} : \mathcal{V} - \Sigma' \to \mathbb{P}\big(\mathbb{C}^{n\times n} \times \mathbb{C}\big)$ is a bijective map onto its image $\pi_1(\mathcal{V} - \Sigma')$. Therefore, given $A \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^{n\times n}) - \Sigma$, we have $\#\pi^{-1}(A) = \#p|_{\pi_1(\mathcal{V})}{}^{-1}(A)$, where p is the projection map given in (2.4). Moreover, from [15, Corollary 5.6], we get that $\#p|_{\pi_1(\mathcal{V})}{}^{-1}(A) = \deg \pi_1(\mathcal{V})$, where deg is the degree of the projective algebraic subvariety $\pi_1(\mathcal{V}) \subset \mathbb{P}\big(\mathbb{C}^{n\times n} \times \mathbb{C}\big)$. Since $\dim \pi_1(\mathcal{V}) = \dim(\mathcal{V})$ and the fact that $\pi_1|_{\mathcal{V}-\Sigma'} : \mathcal{V} - \Sigma' \to \pi_1(\mathcal{V} - \Sigma')$ is bijective, we get that $\#(\Lambda \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}^n)) \cap \mathcal{V} = \#\Lambda \cap \pi_1(\mathcal{V})$, for a generic (n^2-1)-codimension plane $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{P}\big(\mathbb{C}^{n\times n} \times \mathbb{C}\big)$. Then, we obtain that $\deg \pi_1(\mathcal{V}) = \deg_{(n^2-1,0)}(\mathcal{V})$. $\square$

Remark 2.4. From this proposition we get that the map $\pi|_{\mathcal{V}-\pi^{-1}(\Sigma)} : \mathcal{V} - \pi^{-1}(\Sigma) \to \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}^{n\times n}) - \Sigma$ is a n-fold covering map.

2.2.2. *Unitary Invariance.* Let $\mathbb{U}_n(\mathbb{K})$ stand for the unitary group when $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$ or the orthogonal group when $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$. The group $\mathbb{U}_n(\mathbb{K})$ acts on $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^n)$ in the natural way, and acts on $\mathbb{K}^{n\times n}$ by sending $A \mapsto UAU^{-1}$. Moreover if $(A, \lambda, v) \in \mathcal{V}$, then $(UAU^{-1}, \lambda, Uv) \in \mathcal{V}$. Thus, $\mathcal{V}$ is invariant under the product action $\mathbb{U}_n(\mathbb{K}) \times \mathcal{V} \to \mathcal{V}$ given by

$$U \cdot (A, \lambda, v) \mapsto (UAU^{-1}, \lambda, Uv), \quad U \in \mathbb{U}_n(\mathbb{K}). \tag{2.6}$$

Remark 2.5. Note that the group $\mathbb{U}_n(\mathbb{K})$ preserves the Hermitian structure on $\mathcal{V}$, therefore $\mathbb{U}_n(\mathbb{K})$ acts by isometries on $\mathcal{V}$.

3. CONDITION NUMBERS

In this section we introduce the eigenvalue and eigenvector condition numbers, and we define the condition number for the eigenvalue problem. We will discuss the condition number theorem for this framework, which relates the condition number with the distance to ill-posedness. In the last part of this section we study the rate of change of condition numbers.

3.1. **Eigenvalue and Eigenvector Condition Numbers.**

When (A, λ, v) belongs to $\mathcal{W}$, according to the implicit function theorem, π has an inverse defined in some neighborhood $\mathcal{U}_A \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^{n\times n})$ of A such that $\pi^{-1}(A) = (A, \lambda, v)$. This map $\mathscr{S} = \pi^{-1}|_{\mathcal{U}_A} : \mathcal{U}_A \to \mathcal{V}$ is called the *solution map.* It associates to any matrix $B \in \mathcal{U}_A$ the eigentriple (B, λ_B, v_B) close to (A, λ, v). Its derivative

$$D\mathscr{S}(A, \lambda, v) : T_A\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^{n\times n}) \to T_{(A,\lambda,v)}\mathcal{V},$$

is called the *condition operator* at (A, λ, v).

If $(A, \lambda, v) \in \mathcal{W}$, the derivative $D\mathscr{S}(A, \lambda, v)$ associates to each $\dot{B} \in T_A\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^{n\times n})$ a triple $(\dot{A}, \dot{\lambda}, \dot{v})$ satisfying (2.3). Moreover, equation (2.3) defines two linear maps,

$$D\mathscr{S}_\lambda(A, \lambda, v)\dot{B} = (\dot{A}, \dot{\lambda}) \quad \text{and} \quad D\mathscr{S}_v(A, \lambda, v)\dot{B} = \dot{v},$$

namely, the condition operators of the eigenvalue and eigenvector respectively.

Lemma 3.1. *Let* $(A, \lambda, v) \in \mathcal{W}$. *Then for* $\dot{B} \in T_A\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^{n\times n})$, *one gets:*

(i)

$$D\mathscr{S}_\lambda(A,\lambda,v)\dot{B} = \big(\dot{B} - \dot{\lambda}\frac{\overline{\lambda}}{\|A\|_F}A, \dot{\lambda}\big), \quad \textit{where} \ \ \dot{\lambda} = \frac{\langle \dot{B}v, u\rangle}{\left(1+\frac{|\lambda|^2}{\|A\|_F^2}\right)\langle v,u\rangle};$$

(ii)

$$D\mathscr{S}_v(A,\lambda,v)\dot{B} = \Pi_{v^\perp}(\lambda I_n - A)|_{v^\perp}{}^{-1}\left(\Pi_{v^\perp}(\dot{B}v)\right),$$

where $u\in\mathbb{K}^n$ is a left eigenvector of A with eigenvalue λ: a non-zero vector satisfying $(\lambda I_n - A)^*u = 0$.

Proof. (i): Note that the relation between $\dot{B}\in A^\perp$ and $(\dot{A},\dot{\lambda})\in(A,\lambda)^\perp$ is given by

$$\dot{B} = \dot{A} + \frac{\dot{\lambda}\cdot\overline{\lambda}}{\|A\|_F^2}A. \tag{3.1}$$

Moreover, from (2.3) we get $\langle \dot{A}v, u\rangle = \dot{\lambda}\langle v,u\rangle$, i.e.

$$\dot{\lambda} = \frac{\langle \dot{A}v,u\rangle}{\langle v,u\rangle}. \tag{3.2}$$

From (3.1) and (3.2) follows

$$\dot{\lambda} = \frac{1}{1+\frac{|\lambda|^2}{\|A\|_F^2}}\,\frac{\langle \dot{B}v,u\rangle}{\langle v,u\rangle}.$$

(ii): From (2.3) again one gets

$$\dot{v} = \Pi_{v^\perp}(\lambda I_n - A)|_{v^\perp}{}^{-1}\left(\Pi_{v^\perp}(\dot{A}v)\right).$$

Since $\Pi_{v^\perp}(\dot{B}v) = \Pi_{v^\perp}(\dot{A}v)$ by (3.1), the result follows. □

Since $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^{n\times n})$ is equipped with the canonical Hermitian structure induced by the Frobenius Hermitian product on $\mathbb{K}^{n\times n}$, the condition numbers of the eigenvalue and eigenvector are given by

$$\mu_\lambda(A,\lambda,v) = \sup_{\substack{\dot{B}\in A^\perp\\ \|\dot{B}\|_F=\|A\|_F}} \|D\mathscr{S}_\lambda(A,\lambda,v)\dot{B}\|_{(A,\lambda)}$$

$$\mu_v(A,\lambda,v) = \sup_{\substack{\dot{B}\in A^\perp\\ \|\dot{B}\|_F=\|A\|_F}} \|D\mathscr{S}_v(A,\lambda,v)\dot{B}\|_v$$

Proposition 3.1. *Let $(A,\lambda,v)\in\mathcal{W}$. Then*

(i)

$$\mu_\lambda(A,\lambda,v) = \frac{1}{1+\frac{|\lambda|^2}{\|A\|_F^2}}\cdot\left[1+\frac{\|v\|^2\cdot\|u\|^2}{|\langle v,u\rangle|^2}\right]^{1/2};$$

(ii)

$$\mu_v(A,\lambda,v) = \|A\|_F\cdot\|\Pi_{v^\perp}(\lambda I_n - A)|_{v^\perp}{}^{-1}\|,$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ is the operator norm.

Remark 3.1. $\Pi_{v^\perp}(\lambda I_n - A)|_{v^\perp}$ is a linear map from the Hermitian complement of v in $\mathbb{K}^n$ into itself. Hence the operator norm of its inverse is independent of the representative of v.

Proof. (i): From *Lemma 3.1*,

$$\begin{aligned}\|D\mathscr{S}_\lambda(A,\lambda,v)\dot{B}\|^2_{(A,\lambda)} &= \frac{\|A\|_F^2 + |\dot{\lambda}|^2\left(1+\frac{|\lambda|^2}{\|A\|_F^2}\right)}{\|A\|_F^2+|\lambda|^2} \\ &= \frac{\|A\|_F^2 + \left|\frac{\langle \dot{B}v,u\rangle}{\langle v,u\rangle}\right|^2\left(1+\frac{|\lambda|^2}{\|A\|_F^2}\right)^{-1}}{\|A\|_F^2+|\lambda|^2}.\end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

Then, the proof of (i) can be deduced from the following result:

$$\sup_{\substack{\dot{B}\in A^\perp\\ \|\dot{B}\|_F=\|A\|_F}} \left|\langle \dot{B}v,u\rangle\right| = \|A\|_F\cdot\sqrt{\|v\|^2\cdot\|u\|^2-\frac{|\lambda|^2}{\|A\|_F^2}\cdot|\langle v,u\rangle|^2}.$$

(The proof is left to the reader).

(ii): Since $Av=\lambda v$, we have $\Pi_{v^\perp}(\dot{B}v)=\Pi_{v^\perp}((\dot{B}+\alpha A)v)$, for any $\alpha\in\mathbb{K}$ and $\dot{B}\in A^\perp$. Then, from *Lemma 3.1* we get:

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_v(A,\lambda,v) &= \sup_{\substack{\dot{B}\in A^\perp\\ \|\dot{B}\|_F=\|A\|_F}} \left\|\Pi_{v^\perp}(\lambda I_n - A)|_{v^\perp}{}^{-1}\left(\Pi_{v^\perp}(\dot{B}v)\right)\right\|_v \\ &= \sup_{\substack{\dot{B}\in\mathbb{K}^{n\times n}\\ \|\dot{B}\|_F=1}} \|A\|_F\cdot\left\|\Pi_{v^\perp}(\lambda I_n - A)|_{v^\perp}{}^{-1}\left(\Pi_{v^\perp}(\dot{B}v)\right)\right\|_v.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\{\Pi_{v^\perp}(\dot{B}v):\ \dot{B}\in\mathbb{K}^{n\times n},\ \|\dot{B}\|_F=1\}$ fill the ball of radius $\|v\|$ in $v^\perp$, the result follows. □

Corollary 2. *μ_λ and μ_v are invariant under the action of $\mathbb{U}_n(\mathbb{K})$.*

Remark 3.2. Let $(A,\lambda,v)\in\mathcal{W}$. If $(\lambda I_n - A)^*v=0$, that is, if v is also a left eigenvector of A with eigenvalue λ, then,

$$\mu_\lambda(A,\lambda,v)=\frac{\sqrt{2}}{1+\frac{|\lambda|^2}{\|A\|_F^2}}.$$

In particular, this is the case when A is normal, i.e. $A^*A=AA^*$. On the other hand, μ_v happens to be more interesting since, roughly speaking, it measures how close to λ others eigenvalues are.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $A\in\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^{n\times n})$ be a normal matrix. If $(A,\lambda,v)\in\mathcal{W}$ then*

$$\mu_v(A,\lambda,v)=\frac{\|A\|_F}{\min_i|\lambda-\lambda_i|},$$

where the minimum is taken for λ_i eigenvalue of A different from λ.

Proof. Since A is normal, by the unitary invariance of μ_v, we may assume that A is the diagonal matrix $\mathrm{Diag}(\lambda,\lambda_2,\ldots,\lambda_n)$, where λ,λ_i are the eigenvalues of A. Moreover, since $(A,\lambda,v)\in\mathcal{W}$, $\lambda\neq\lambda_i$ for $i=2,\ldots n$. Then, the result follows from *Proposition 3.1.* □

3.2. **Condition Number Revisited.** The condition number of a computational problem is usually defined as the operator norm of the map giving the first order variation of the output in terms of the first order variation of the input. In our case the condition number should be the operator norm of the condition operator $D\mathscr{S}(A,\lambda,v)$ given in *Section 3*, i.e.

$$\|D\mathscr{S}(A,\lambda,v)\| := \sup_{\substack{\dot{B}\in A^{\perp}\\ \|\dot{B}\|_F=\|A\|_F}} \|D\mathscr{S}(A,\lambda,v)\dot{B}\|_{(A,\lambda,v)}.$$

Note that this quantity is bounded below by $\mu_v(A,\lambda,v)$ and above by $(\mu_\lambda(A,\lambda,v)^2+\mu_v(A,\lambda,v)^2)^{1/2}$. However, in spite of this definition, we define the condition number of the eigenvalue problem in the following way.

Definition 2 (Condition Number)**.** The condition number of the eigenvalue problem is defined by

$$\mu(A,\lambda,v) := \max\{1,\mu_v(A,\lambda,v)\}. \tag{3.4}$$

In the next proposition we show that this definition and the usual one are essentially equivalent.

Proposition 3.2. *Let* $(A,\lambda,v)\in\mathcal{W}$. *Then*

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\cdot\mu(A,\lambda,v)\le\|D\mathscr{S}(A,\lambda,v)\|\le 2\cdot\mu(A,\lambda,v)$$

The proof follows from the next lemma.

Lemma 3.3. *Let* $(A,\lambda,v)\in\mathcal{W}$. *Then,*

(i) $\mu_v(A,\lambda,v)\ge 1/\sqrt{2}$;

(ii)
$$\mu_\lambda(A,\lambda,v)\le\frac{1}{1+\frac{|\lambda|^2}{\|A\|_F^2}}\cdot(2+\mu_v(A,\lambda,v)^2)^{1/2}.$$

Proof. Fix a representative of $(A,\lambda,v)\in\mathcal{W}$ such that $\|v\|=1$.
(i): One has,

$$\|\Pi_{v^\perp}(\lambda I_n-A)|_{v^\perp}\|\le\|\Pi_{v^\perp}(A)|_{v^\perp}\|+|\lambda|\le\sqrt{2}\|A\|_F,$$

that is, $\|\Pi_{v^\perp}(\lambda I_n-A)|_{v^\perp}\|\le\sqrt{2}$. Therefore,

$$1=\|\left(\Pi_{v^\perp}(\lambda I_n-A)|_{v^\perp}\right)^{-1}\Pi_{v^\perp}(\lambda I_n-A)|_{v^\perp}\|\le\sqrt{2}\mu_v(A,\lambda,v).$$

(ii): Since the action of $\mathbb{U}_n(\mathbb{K})$ on $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^n)$ is transitive, we may assume that v is the first element of the canonical basis. Then A has the form $\begin{pmatrix}\lambda & w\\ 0 & \hat{A}\end{pmatrix}$, where $w\in\mathbb{K}^{1\times(n-1)}$ and $\hat{A}\in\mathbb{K}^{(n-1)\times(n-1)}$. Then $A-\lambda I_n=\begin{pmatrix}0 & w\\ 0 & \hat{A}-\lambda I_{n-1}\end{pmatrix}$. Note that $u=(1,-(\hat{A}-\lambda I_{n-1})^{-*}w^*)^T$ is solution of $(A-\lambda I_n)^*u=0$, i.e. u is a left eigenvector. Here, $\cdot^T$ and $\cdot^*$ denotes the transpose and conjugate transpose respectively. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{|\langle v,u\rangle|}{\|v\|\cdot\|u\|} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+\|(\hat{A}-\lambda I_{n-1})^{-*}w^*\|^2}}\\ &\geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+\|(\hat{A}-\lambda I_{n-1})^{-1}\|^2\cdot\|w\|^2}}\\ &\geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+\|(\hat{A}-\lambda I_{n-1})^{-1}\|^2\cdot\|A\|_F^2}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+\mu_v(A,\lambda,v)^2}}.\end{aligned}$$

The result now follows from *Proposition 3.1.* □

The next subsection is included for the sake of completeness but is not needed for the proof of our main results.

3.3. **Condition Number Theorems.**

In this subsection we study the relation of $\mu_\lambda(A,\lambda,v)$, $\mu_v(A,\lambda,v)$ and $\mu(A,\lambda,v)$ with the distance of (A,λ,v) to Σ'. The main result in this subsection is that $\mu(A,\lambda,v)$ is bounded above by $\sin(d_{\mathbb{P}^2}(A,\lambda,v),\Sigma'))^{-1}$.

Let $(\mathbb{E},\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle)$ be a finite dimensional Hermitian vector space over $\mathbb{K}$. Given Λ a projective subset in $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})$, we denote by $\hat{\Lambda}\subset\mathbb{E}$ its affine extension.

Lemma 3.4. *Given $x\in\mathbb{E}$, $x\neq 0$, we have*

$$\sin(d_{\mathbb{P}}(x,\Lambda)) = \frac{d_{\mathbb{E}}(A,\hat{\Lambda})}{\|x\|},$$

where $d_{\mathbb{E}}$ is the distance generated by $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$.

Proof. The proof is straightforward. □

The next proposition is a version, adapted to this context, of known results given by Wilkinson [23]) and Shub-Smale [18] .

Recall that $\Sigma=\pi(\Sigma')\subset\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^{n\times n})$.

Proposition 3.3. *Let $(A,\lambda,v)\in\mathcal{W}$. Then*

(i)

$$\mu_\lambda(A,\lambda,v)\leq\sqrt{\frac{2}{\sin(d_{\mathbb{P}}(A,\Sigma))^2}+1};$$

(ii)

$$\mu_v(A,\lambda,v)=\frac{\|A\|_F}{d_F(A,\hat{\Sigma}_v+\lambda I_n)},$$

where $\Sigma_v=\{B\in\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^{n\times n}):\,(B,0,v)\in\Sigma'\}\subset\Sigma$.

Proof. (i) Let $\hat{\Sigma}\subset\mathbb{K}^{n\times n}$ be the affine extension of Σ in $\mathbb{K}^{n\times n}$, and let u be a left eigenvector associated to A with eigenvalue λ. Wilkinson shows that:

$$\frac{\|v\|\cdot\|u\|}{|\langle v,u\rangle|}\leq\sqrt{2}\frac{\|A\|_F}{d_F(A,\hat{\Sigma})},$$

(cf. Demmel [11], Wilkinson [23]). Then, (i) follows from *Proposition 3.1* and *Lemma 3.4*.
(ii) In Shub-Smale [18] it is proved that, for a fixed triple $(A, \lambda, v) \in \mathcal{V}$,

$$d_F(\lambda I_n - A, \hat{\Sigma}_v) = \frac{1}{\|\Pi_{v^\perp}(\lambda I_n - A)|_{v^\perp}{}^{-1}\|}.$$

Then, (ii) follows from *Lemma 3.1*. $\square$

Corollary 3. *For $(A, \lambda, v) \in \mathcal{W}$, we get*

$$\mu(A, \lambda, v) \leq \frac{1}{\sin(d_{\mathbb{P}}(A, \Sigma))}.$$

Proof. Since $\hat{\Sigma}_v + \alpha I_n \subset \hat{\Sigma}$ for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{K}$, we conclude from *Lemma 3.4* that:

$$\mu_v(A, \lambda, v) \leq \frac{1}{\sin(d_{\mathbb{P}}(A, \Sigma))}.$$

Moveover, since the second member is greater than one, the proof follows. $\square$

Proposition 3.4. *For $(A, \lambda, v) \in \mathcal{W}$, we get*

$$\mu(A, \lambda, v) \leq \frac{1}{\sin(d_{\mathbb{P}^2}((A, \lambda, v), \Sigma'))}.$$

Proof. Let $\Sigma''_v := \{(B, \eta) \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^{n\times n} \times \mathbb{K}) : (B, \eta, v) \in \Sigma'\}$, and $\hat{\Sigma}''_v$ its affine extension in $\mathbb{K}^{n\times n} \times \mathbb{K}$. Note that

$$d_{\mathbb{K}^{n\times n}\times\mathbb{K}}((A, \lambda), \hat{\Sigma}''_v) = d_F(A - \lambda I_n, \hat{\Sigma}_v),$$

where Σ_v is defined in *Proposition 3.3*. Then, from *Proposition 3.3*, we get

$$d_{\mathbb{K}^{n\times n}\times\mathbb{K}}((A, \lambda), \hat{\Sigma}''_v) = \frac{\|A\|_F}{\mu_v(A, \lambda, v)}.$$

Since $\pi_1^{-1}(\Sigma''_v) \subset \Sigma'$, we get

$$d_{\mathbb{P}^2}((A, \lambda, v), \Sigma') \leq d_{\mathbb{P}^2}\left((A, \lambda, v), \pi_1^{-1}(\Sigma''_v)\right) = d_{\mathbb{P}}((A, \lambda), \Sigma''_v)).$$

Then, the result follows from the fact that $\sin(\cdot) \leq 1$. $\square$

3.4. **Condition Number Sensitivity.** For the proof of *Theorem 2* we have to study the rate of change of the condition number μ defined in (3.4).

The main result of this subsection is the following.

Proposition 3.5. *Given $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist $C_\varepsilon > 0$ such that, if (A, λ, v), (A', λ', v') belongs to $\mathcal{W}$ and*

$$d_{\mathbb{P}^2}\big((A, \lambda, v), (A', \lambda', v')\big) < \frac{C_\varepsilon}{\mu(A, \lambda, v)}$$

then

$$\frac{\mu(A, \lambda, v)}{1 + \varepsilon} \leq \mu(A', \lambda', v') \leq (1 + \varepsilon)\mu(A, \lambda, v).$$

(One may choose $C_\varepsilon = \frac{\arctan\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2\sqrt{2}+\sqrt{2}\alpha(1+\varepsilon)}\right)}{(1+\varepsilon)}$, where $\alpha := (1 + \sqrt{5})2\sqrt{2}$).

Before proving *Proposition 3.5* we need some additional notation.

When $\mathbb{E}$ is a finite dimensional vector space over $\mathbb{K}$ equipped with the Hermitian inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$, we define

$$d_T(w, w') := \tan(d_{\mathbb{P}}(w, w')), \tag{3.5}$$

for all w, $w' \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})$. We have

$$d_T(w, w') = \|w - w'\|_w,$$

whenever w and w' satisfy $\langle w - w', w \rangle = 0$.

Note that $d_{\mathbb{P}}(\cdot, \cdot) \leq d_T(\cdot, \cdot)$. Moreover, we have:

Lemma 3.5. *Let w, $w' \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})$ such that $d_{\mathbb{P}}(w, w') \leq \theta < \pi/2$. Then*

$$d_{\mathbb{P}}(w, w') \leq d_T(w, w') \leq \frac{\tan(\theta)}{\theta} \cdot d_{\mathbb{P}}(w, w'), \quad \text{for all}\, w,\ w' \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E}).$$

Proof. This follows from elementary facts. □

Given $w \in \mathbb{K}^n$, $w \neq 0$, we define for any $B \in \mathbb{K}^{n \times n}$ the map

$$\hat{\Pi}_{w^\perp} B : \mathbb{K}^n \to \mathbb{K}^n, \quad \text{by} \quad \hat{\Pi}_{w^\perp} B := \tau \circ \Pi_{w^\perp} B,$$

where $\tau : w^\perp \to \mathbb{K}^n$ is the inclusion map. That is,

$$\hat{\Pi}_{w^\perp} B z = Bz - \langle Bz, \frac{w}{\|w\|} \rangle \frac{w}{\|w\|}.$$

Since $\left(\hat{\Pi}_{v^\perp}(\lambda I_n - A)\right) v = 0$ for all $(A, \lambda, v) \in \mathcal{W}$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_v(A, \lambda, v) &= \|A\|_F \cdot \left\| \Pi_{v^\perp}(\lambda I_n - A)|_{v^\perp}{}^{-1} \right\| \\ &= \|A\|_F \cdot \left\| \left(\hat{\Pi}_{v^\perp}(\lambda I_n - A) \right)^\dagger \right\|, \end{aligned}$$

where $\dagger$ is the Moore-Penrose inverse.

Lemma 3.6. *Let v, $w \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^n)$ and $B \in \mathbb{K}^{n \times n}$. Then*

$$\left\| \hat{\Pi}_{v^\perp} B - \hat{\Pi}_{w^\perp} B \right\| \leq 2\|B\| \cdot d_T(v, w).$$

Proof. Take representatives of v and w such that $\|v\| = 1$ and $\langle v - w, v \rangle = 0$. Let $u \in \mathbb{K}^n$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \left(\hat{\Pi}_{v^\perp} B - \hat{\Pi}_{w^\perp} B \right) u \right\| &= \left\| Bu - \langle Bu, v \rangle v - \left(Bu - \langle Bu, \frac{w}{\|w\|} \rangle \frac{w}{\|w\|} \right) \right\| \\ &= \left\| \langle Bu, \frac{w}{\|w\|} \rangle \frac{w}{\|w\|} - \langle Bu, v \rangle v \right\| \\ &\leq \left\| \langle Bu, \frac{w}{\|w\|} - v \rangle \frac{w}{\|w\|} + \langle Bu, v \rangle \left(\frac{w}{\|w\|} - v \right) \right\| \\ &\leq 2\|Bu\| \cdot \left\| \frac{w}{\|w\|} - v \right\| \leq 2\|Bu\| \cdot d_T(v, w). \end{aligned}$$

□

Let d_{T^2} be the product function defined over $\mathbb{P}\big(\mathbb{K}^{n \times n} \times \mathbb{K}\big) \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^n)$ by

$$d_{T^2}((A, \lambda, v), (A', \lambda', v')) := \left(d_T((A, \lambda), (A', \lambda'))^2 + d_T(v, v')^2 \right)^{1/2}$$

Proposition 3.6. *Let* $\alpha := (1+\sqrt{5})2\sqrt{2}$.
Let $(A,\lambda,v),(A',\lambda',v') \in \mathcal{W}$ *such that*

$$d_{T^2}\big((A,\lambda,v),(A',\lambda',v')\big) < \frac{1}{\alpha\cdot\mu_v(A,\lambda,v)}.$$

Then, the following inequality holds:

$$\mu_v(A',\lambda',v') \leq \frac{(1+\sqrt{2}d_{T^2}\big((A,\lambda,v),(A',\lambda',v')\big))\cdot\mu_v(A,\lambda,v)}{1-\alpha\cdot\mu_v(A,\lambda,v)\cdot d_{T^2}\big((A,\lambda,v),(A',\lambda',v')\big)}.$$

Proof. Consider representatives of (A,λ,v) and (A',λ',v') such that: $\|A\|_F = \|v\| = 1$, $(A,\lambda)-(A',\lambda')$ perpendicular to (A,λ) in $\mathbb{K}^{n\times n}\times\mathbb{K}$, and $v-v'$ perpendicular to v in $\mathbb{K}^n$.
Notation: for short, let $A_\lambda := (\lambda I_n - A)$ and $A'_{\lambda'} := (\lambda' I_n - A')$.
By Wedin's Theorem (see Stewart-Sun [20], Theorem 3.9) we have

$$\left\|\left(\hat{\Pi}_{v^\perp}A_\lambda\right)^\dagger - \left(\hat{\Pi}_{v'^\perp}A'_{\lambda'}\right)^\dagger\right\| \leq \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}\cdot\left\|\left(\hat{\Pi}_{v^\perp}A_\lambda\right)^\dagger\right\|\cdot\left\|\left(\hat{\Pi}_{v'^\perp}A'_{\lambda'}\right)^\dagger\right\|\cdot\left\|\hat{\Pi}_{v^\perp}A_\lambda - \hat{\Pi}_{v'^\perp}A'_{\lambda'}\right\|.$$

Since $\left|\left\|\left(\hat{\Pi}_{v^\perp}A_\lambda\right)^\dagger\right\| - \left\|\left(\hat{\Pi}_{v'^\perp}A'_{\lambda'}\right)^\dagger\right\|\right| \leq \left\|\left(\hat{\Pi}_{v^\perp}A_\lambda\right)^\dagger - \left(\hat{\Pi}_{v'^\perp}A'_{\lambda'}\right)^\dagger\right\|$, then,

$$\left\|\left(\hat{\Pi}_{v'^\perp}A'_{\lambda'}\right)^\dagger\right\| \leq \frac{\left\|\left(\hat{\Pi}_{v^\perp}A_\lambda\right)^\dagger\right\|}{1-\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}\cdot\left\|\left(\hat{\Pi}_{v^\perp}A_\lambda\right)^\dagger\right\|\cdot\left\|\hat{\Pi}_{v^\perp}A_\lambda - \hat{\Pi}_{v'^\perp}A'_{\lambda'}\right\|}.$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\hat{\Pi}_{v^\perp}A_\lambda - \hat{\Pi}_{v'^\perp}A'_{\lambda'}\right\| &\leq \left\|\hat{\Pi}_{v^\perp}A_\lambda - \hat{\Pi}_{v'^\perp}A_\lambda\right\| + \left\|\hat{\Pi}_{v'^\perp}A_\lambda - \hat{\Pi}_{v'^\perp}A'_{\lambda'}\right\|\\ &\leq 2\cdot\|A_\lambda\|\cdot d_T(v,v') + \|A_\lambda - A'_{\lambda'}\|,\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from *Lemma 3.6*. Moreover, taking into account that $(A,\lambda,v)\in\mathcal{W}$ and the choice of elected representatives, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\|A_\lambda - A'_{\lambda'}\| &\leq \|A-A'\| + |\lambda-\lambda'|\\ &\leq \sqrt{2}\cdot d_T((A,\lambda),(A',\lambda'))\cdot\sqrt{\|A\|_F^2+|\lambda|^2}\\ &\leq 2\cdot d_T((A,\lambda),(A',\lambda')),\end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\left\|\hat{\Pi}_{v^\perp}A_\lambda - \hat{\Pi}_{v'^\perp}A'_{\lambda'}\right\| \leq 4\cdot d_T(v,v') + 2\cdot d_T((A,\lambda),(A',\lambda')).$$

Then we conclude

$$\left\|\left(\hat{\Pi}_{v'^\perp}A'_{\lambda'}\right)^\dagger\right\| \leq \frac{\left\|\left(\hat{\Pi}_{v^\perp}A_\lambda\right)^\dagger\right\|}{1-(1+\sqrt{5})2\sqrt{2}\cdot\left\|\left(\hat{\Pi}_{v^\perp}A_\lambda\right)^\dagger\right\|\cdot d_{T^2}((A,\lambda,v),(A',\lambda',v'))}.$$

The proposition follows from the following fact: $\|A'\|_F \leq 1 + \|A - A'\|_F \leq 1 + \sqrt{2} d_T((A,\lambda),(A',\lambda'))$. ☐

Proposition 3.7. *Given $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist $c_\varepsilon > 0$ such that, if (A,λ,v), $(A',\lambda',v') \in \mathcal{W}$ and*

$$d_{T^2}\big((A,\lambda,v),(A',\lambda',v')\big) < \frac{c_\varepsilon}{\mu(A,\lambda,v)},$$

then,

$$\mu(A',\lambda',v') \leq (1+\varepsilon)\mu(A,\lambda,v).$$

(One may choose $c_\varepsilon = \frac{\varepsilon}{2\sqrt{2}+\sqrt{2}\alpha(1+\varepsilon)}$, where $\alpha = (1+\sqrt{5})2\sqrt{2}$.)

Proof. It is enough to prove the assertion for μ_v instead of μ.
Recall from *Lemma 3.3* that μ_v is bounded below by $1/\sqrt{2}$. Hence,

$$d_{T^2}\big((A,\lambda,v),(A',\lambda',v')\big) < \frac{c}{\mu(A,\lambda,v)},$$

implies

$$d_{T^2}\big((A,\lambda,v),(A',\lambda',v')\big) < \frac{\sqrt{2}\,c}{\mu_v(A,\lambda,v)}.$$

From *Proposition 3.6*, if c is such that $\sqrt{2}c < 1/\alpha$ and

$$\frac{1+2\sqrt{2}c}{1-\sqrt{2}\alpha c} < 1+\varepsilon,$$

we get the result.
One may choose $c_\varepsilon = \dfrac{\varepsilon}{2\sqrt{2}+\sqrt{2}\alpha(1+\varepsilon)}$.

☐

Corollary 4. *Given $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist $c'_\varepsilon > 0$ such that, if (A,λ,v), $(A',\lambda',v') \in \mathcal{W}$ and*

$$d_{\mathbb{P}^2}\big((A,\lambda,v),(A',\lambda',v')\big) < \frac{c'_\varepsilon}{\mu(A,\lambda,v)},$$

then,

$$\mu(A',\lambda',v') \leq (1+\varepsilon)\mu(A,\lambda,v).$$

(One may choose $c'_\varepsilon = \arctan\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2\sqrt{2}+\sqrt{2}\alpha(1+\varepsilon)}\right)$ where $\alpha := (1+\sqrt{5})2\sqrt{2}$.)

Proof. By *Lemma 3.4*, if

$$d_{\mathbb{P}^2}\big((A,\lambda,v),(A',\lambda',v')\big) < \frac{c'}{\mu(A,\lambda,v)},$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} d_{T^2}\big((A,\lambda,v),(A',\lambda',v')\big) &\leq \frac{\tan(c')}{c'} \cdot d_{\mathbb{P}^2}\big((A,\lambda,v),(A',\lambda',v')\big) \\ &< \frac{\tan(c')}{\mu(A,\lambda,v)}, \end{aligned}$$

proving the lemma. ☐

Proof of Proposition 3.5. From *Corollary 4*, there exist $c' > 0$ such that, if (A, λ, v), $(A', \lambda', v') \in \mathcal{W}$ are such that

$$d_{\mathbb{P}^2}\big((A, \lambda, v), (A', \lambda', v')\big) \cdot \mu(A, \lambda, v) < c',$$

then

$$\mu(A', \lambda', v') \leq (1 + \varepsilon)\mu(A, \lambda, v).$$

It is enough to take c' such that $c' \leq \arctan\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2\sqrt{2}+\sqrt{2}\alpha(1+\varepsilon)}\right)$. In this case we have

$$d_{\mathbb{P}^2}\big((A, \lambda, v), (A', \lambda', v')\big) \cdot \mu(A', \lambda', v') < c'(1 + \varepsilon).$$

Then, by the same argument, if $c'(1 + \varepsilon) \leq \arctan\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2\sqrt{2}+\sqrt{2}\alpha(1+\varepsilon)}\right)$ we have the other inequality. □

4. Newton's Method

In this section we start describing the Newton method defined in the *Introduction*. The main goal of this section is to prove *Theorem 1*.

4.1. **Introduction.**

Let us recall the definition of the Newton map on $\mathbb{P}\big(\mathbb{K}^{n\times n} \times \mathbb{K}\big) \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^n)$. We define

$$N(A, \lambda, v) := \big(A, N_A(\lambda, v)\big),$$

where N_A is the Newton map, given in (1.1), associated to the evaluation map $F_A(\lambda, v) = (\lambda I_n - A)v$, for a fixed (non-zero) matrix A and $(\lambda, v) \in \mathbb{K} \times \mathbb{K}^n$.

Note that N_A has the simple matrix expression

$$N_A\begin{pmatrix}\lambda\\ v\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix}\lambda\\ v\end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix}v & \lambda I_n - A\\ 0 & v^*\end{pmatrix}^{-1}\begin{pmatrix}\lambda\\ v\end{pmatrix}.$$

To compute the Newton map we have to solve for $(\dot{\lambda}, \dot{v}) \in \mathbb{K} \times \mathbb{K}^n$ the following linear system:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\lambda}v + (\lambda I_n - A)\dot{v} &= (\lambda I_n - A)v,\\ \langle \dot{v}, v\rangle &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Then one gets:

Lemma 4.1. *If* $\Pi_{v^\perp}(\lambda I_n - A)|_{v^\perp}$ *is invertible, then the Newton iteration is given by*

$$N(A, \lambda, v) = (A, \lambda - \dot{\lambda}, v - \dot{v}),$$

where

$$\dot{v} = \big(\Pi_{v^\perp}(\lambda I_n - A)\big|_{v^\perp}\big)^{-1}\,\Pi_{v^\perp}(\lambda I_n - A)v,$$
$$\dot{\lambda} = \frac{\langle(\lambda I_n - A)(v - \dot{v}), v\rangle}{\langle v, v\rangle}.$$

From *Lemma 4.1*, we conclude that N is a well-defined map on the product space $\mathbb{P}\big(\mathbb{K}^{n\times n} \times \mathbb{K}\big) \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^n)$. Moreover, for a fixed matrix $A \in \mathbb{K}^{n\times n}$, $A \neq 0_n$, we conclude also that the map N_A is well-defined on $\mathbb{K} \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^n)$.

4.2. γ-Theorem.

In order to prove *Theorem 1* and *Theorem 2* we need to obtain a version of the γ-Theorem for the Newton map $N_A : \mathbb{K} \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^n) \to \mathbb{K} \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^n)$.

Proposition 4.1. *Let* $0 < u \leq 1/(2\sqrt{2})$.
Let $(A, \lambda, v) \in \mathcal{W}$ *such that* $\|A\|_F = 1$, *and let* $(\lambda_0, v_0) \in \mathbb{K} \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^n)$.
If

$$(|\lambda_0 - \lambda|^2 + d_{\mathbb{P}}(v_0, v)^2)^{1/2} < \frac{u}{\mu(A, \lambda, v)},$$

then, the Newton sequence $(\lambda_k, v_k) := N_A^k(\lambda_0, v_0)$ *satisfies*

$$(|\lambda_k - \lambda|^2 + d_{\mathbb{P}}(v_k, v)^2)^{1/2} \leq \left(\frac{2\tan(u)}{1 - \sqrt{2}\,u}\right) \cdot \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{2^k - 1} \cdot (|\lambda_0 - \lambda|^2 + d_{\mathbb{P}}(v_0, v)^2)^{1/2},$$

for all $k > 0$.

This proposition will be the main tool to prove *Theorem 1* and also *Theorem 2*. It is a version -for the Newton map N_A- of a fairly known theorem in the literature, namely, the γ-Theorem, which gives the size of the basin of attraction of Newton's method. In our case, for the Newton map N_A reads:

Theorem 3. *There is a universal constant* $c_0 > 0$ *with the following property. Let* $(A, \lambda, v) \in \mathcal{W}$ *such that* $\|A\|_F = 1$, *and* $(\lambda_0, v_0) \in \mathbb{K} \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^n)$. *If*

$$(|\lambda_0 - \lambda|^2 + d_{\mathbb{P}}(v_0, v)^2)^{1/2} < \frac{c_0}{\mu(A, \lambda, v)},$$

then, the sequence $(\lambda_k, v_k) = N_A^k(\lambda_0, v_0)$ *converges immediately quadratically to* (λ, v) *with respect to the canonical distance in* $\mathbb{K} \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^n)$.
(One may choose $c_0 = 0.288$*).*

Since we do not find an appropriate place to refer to this version, we include a proof of the *Proposition 4.1* in the *Appendix*. Note that the proof of *Theorem 3* follows directly from *Proposition 4.1* picking u such that: $0 < u \leq 1/(2\sqrt{2})$ and $2\tan(u)/(1 - \sqrt{2}u) \leq 1$.

4.3. **Proof of Theorem 1.**

4.3.1. *Preliminaries.*

Lemma 4.2. *Fix a representative of* $(A, \lambda, v) \in \mathcal{V}$ *such that* $\|A\|_F = 1$ *and* $\|v\| = 1$. *Let* $(\lambda', v') \in \mathbb{K} \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^n)$.

1. *If* $|\lambda - \lambda'| \leq c < \sqrt{2}$, *then,*
$$d_{\mathbb{P}^2}\big((A, \lambda, v), (A, \lambda', v')\big) \leq \beta_c \cdot \big(|\lambda - \lambda'|^2 + d_{\mathbb{P}}(v, v')^2\big)^{1/2},$$
where $\beta_c = (1 - c^2/2)^{-1/2}$.
2. *If* $d_{\mathbb{P}^2}\big((A, \lambda, v), (A, \lambda', v')\big) < \theta < \pi/4$, *then,*
$$(|\lambda - \lambda'|^2 + d_T(v, v')^2)^{1/2} \leq R_\theta \cdot d_{\mathbb{P}^2}((A, \lambda.v), (A, \lambda', v')),$$
where $R_\theta = [\sqrt{2}/\cos(\theta + \pi/4)^3]^{1/2}$.

The proof of *Lemma 4.2* is included in the *Appendix*.

Let θ_0 such that $R_{\theta_0}\theta_0 = 1/(2\sqrt{2})$, where R_θ is given in *Lemma 4.2* ($\theta_0 \approx 0.1389$).

Proposition 4.2. *Let* $0 < u \le \theta_0$.
Let (A,λ,v), $(A,\lambda_0,v_0) \in \mathbb{P}\big(\mathbb{K}^{n\times n}\times\mathbb{K}\big)\times\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^n)$. *If* $(A,\lambda,v)\in\mathcal{W}$ *and*

$$d_{\mathbb{P}^2}\big((A,\lambda,v),(A,\lambda_0,v_0)\big) < \frac{u}{\mu(A,\lambda,v)},$$

then

$$d_{\mathbb{P}^2}\big(N^k(A,\lambda_0,v_0),(A,\lambda,v)\big) \le$$
$$\le R_u\,\beta_{u\,R_u}\left(\frac{2\tan(u\,R_u)}{1-\sqrt{2}\,u\,R_u}\right)\cdot\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{2^k-1} d_{\mathbb{P}^2}\big((A,\lambda,v),(A,\lambda_0,v_0)\big),$$

for all $k>0$*, where* $\delta(u) := u/(1-u)$.

Proof. With out loss of generality we may assume $\|A\|_F = 1$ and $\|v\| = 1$.

By *Lemma 4.2* we get

$$(|\lambda_0-\lambda|^2 + d_{\mathbb{P}}(v_0,v)^2)^{1/2} \le \frac{uR_u}{\mu(A,\lambda,v)}. \tag{4.1}$$

Since $u\le\theta_0$, we have $uR_u \le 1/(2\sqrt{2})$, and then from *Proposition 4.1* and *Proposition 6.2*, we get

$$(|\lambda_k-\lambda|^2 + d_{\mathbb{P}}(v_k,v)^2)^{1/2} \le \tag{4.2}$$
$$\left(\frac{2\tan(u\,R_u)}{1-\sqrt{2}\,u\,R_u}\right)\cdot\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{2^k-1}\cdot(|\lambda_0-\lambda|^2 + d_{\mathbb{P}}(v_0,v)^2)^{1/2},$$

for all $k>0$, where $(\lambda_k,v_k) := N_A^k(\lambda_0,v_0)$. Moreover, since $(|\lambda_0-\lambda|^2+d_{\mathbb{P}}(v_0,v)^2)^{1/2} < u\,R_u$, we deduce from *Lemma 4.2* that

$$d_{\mathbb{P}^2}(N^k(A,\lambda_0,v_0),(A,\lambda,v)) \le$$
$$\le \beta_{u\,R_u}\left(\frac{2\tan(u\,R_u)}{1-\sqrt{2}\,u\,R_u}\right)\cdot\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{2^k-1}\cdot(|\lambda_0-\lambda|^2 + d_{\mathbb{P}}(v_0,v)^2)^{1/2}$$
$$\le R_u\,\beta_{u\,R_u}\left(\frac{2\tan(u\,R_u)}{1-\sqrt{2}\,u\,R_u}\right)\cdot\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{2^k-1}\cdot d_{\mathbb{P}^2}((A,\lambda_0,v_0),(A,\lambda,v)).$$

(Note that $u\le\theta_0<\frac{\pi}{4}$.) ☐

4.3.2. *Proof of Theorem 1.*

Proof of Theorem 1. From *Proposition 4.2*, proof of *Theorem 1* follows picking $u_0>0$ such that $u_0\le\theta_0$ and $R_{u_0}\,\beta_{u_0\,R_{u_0}}\left(\frac{2\tan(u_0\,R_{u_0})}{1-\sqrt{2}\,u_0\,R_{u_0}}\right)\le 1$. One may choose $u_0 = 0.0739$. ☐

5. Proof of the Main Theorem

5.1. **Complexity Bound.** In the introduction we defined the condition length of an absolutely continuous path $\Gamma:[a,b]\to\mathcal{W}$ as

$$\ell_\mu(\Gamma) = \int_a^b \|\dot\Gamma(t)\|_{\Gamma(t)}\,\mu(\Gamma(t))\,dt.$$

The next proposition is useful for our *Main Theorem 2*.

Proposition 5.1. *Given $\varepsilon > 0$, $C_\varepsilon > 0$ as in Proposition 3.5, and $\Gamma : [a, b] \to \mathcal{W}$ an absolutely continuous path with $\ell_\mu(\Gamma) < \infty$, define the real sequence $\{s_k\}_{k=0,\dots,K}$ in $[a, b]$ such that:*
•$s_0 = a$;
•s_k such that $\mu(\Gamma(s_{k-1})) \int_{s_{k-1}}^{s_k} \|\dot{\Gamma}(t)\|_{\Gamma(t)} dt = C_\varepsilon$,
whenever $\mu(\Gamma(s_{k-1})) \int_{s_{k-1}}^{b} \|\dot{\Gamma}(t)\|_{\Gamma(t)} dt > C_\varepsilon$;
• else define $s_k = s_K = b$.

Then,

$$K \leq \frac{1+\varepsilon}{C_\varepsilon}\, \ell_\mu(\Gamma) + 1.$$

Proof. Given $s \in [s_{k-1}, s_k]$, $d_{\mathbb{P}^2}(\Gamma(s_{k-1}), \Gamma(s)) \leq \int_{s_{k-1}}^{s_k} \|\dot{\Gamma}(t)\|_{\Gamma(t)} dt \leq \mu(\Gamma(s_{k-1}))^{-1}\, C_\varepsilon$. By the first inequality in *Proposition 3.5*, we get

$$\int_{s_{k-1}}^{s_k} \|\dot{\Gamma}(t)\|_{\Gamma(t)} \mu(\Gamma(t))\, dt \geq \frac{\mu(\Gamma(s_{k-1}))}{1+\varepsilon} \int_{s_{k-1}}^{s_k} \|\dot{\Gamma}(t)\|_{\Gamma(t)} dt = \frac{C_\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon},$$

whenever $k < K$. Since $\ell_\mu(\Gamma) < \infty$, $K < \infty$, and adding, yields

$$\ell_\mu(\Gamma) \geq (K-1)\frac{C_\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}.$$

□

5.2. **Proof of the Main Theorem 2.**

Proof of Theorem 2: Let $A(t)$, $a \leq t \leq b$, be a representative path of the projection $\pi(\Gamma) \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^{n\times n})$ such that $\|A(t)\|_F = 1$ for $a \leq t \leq b$.

Given a mesh $a = t_0 < t_1 < \ldots < t_K = b$, for $k = 0, 1, \ldots, K$, let $\hat{\Gamma}(t_k) = (A(t_k), \lambda_k, v_k) \in \mathbb{K}^{n\times n} \times \mathbb{K} \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^n)$, be the sequence described in *Section 1.3*. Then, if $\Gamma(t_k)$, $\hat{\Gamma}(t_k)$, $\Gamma(t_{k+1})$ are such that,

$$d_{\mathbb{P}^2}(\Gamma(t_k), \Gamma(t_{k+1})) < \frac{C_\varepsilon}{\mu(\Gamma(t_k))}, \quad \text{and} \quad d_{\mathbb{P}^2}(\Gamma(t_k), \hat{\Gamma}(t_k)) < \frac{C_\varepsilon}{\mu(\Gamma(t_k))},$$

then,

$$\begin{aligned} & d_{\mathbb{P}^2}(\Gamma(t_{k+1}), (A(t_{k+1}), \lambda_k, v_k)) \leq \\ & \qquad \leq d_{\mathbb{P}^2}(\Gamma(t_{k+1}), \Gamma(t_k)) + d_{\mathbb{P}^2}(\Gamma(t_k), \hat{\Gamma}(t_k)) + \\ & \qquad\qquad d_{\mathbb{P}^2}(\hat{\Gamma}(t_k), (A(t_{k+1}), \lambda_k, v_k)) \\ & \qquad \leq \frac{2C_\varepsilon}{\mu(\Gamma(t_k))} + d_{\mathbb{P}^2}(\hat{\Gamma}(t_k), (A(t_{k+1}), \lambda_k, v_k)). \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$d_{\mathbb{P}^2}(\hat{\Gamma}(t_k), (A(t_{k+1}), \lambda_k, v_k)) = d_{\mathbb{P}}((A(t_k), \lambda_k), (A(t_{k+1}), \lambda_k)).$$

Since $\|A(t)\|_F = 1$, $a \leq t \leq b$, then, abusing notation, we get

$$d_{\mathbb{P}}((A(t_k), \lambda_k), (A(t_{k+1}), \lambda_k)) \leq d_{\mathbb{P}}(A(t_k), A(t_{k+1})),$$

where the inequality follows from a direct application of the law of cosines. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathbb{P}}(A(t_k), A(t_{k+1})) &\leq \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \|\dot{A}(t)\|_{A(t)}\, dt \\ &\leq \sqrt{2}\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \|D\mathscr{S}_{\lambda}(\Gamma(t))\dot{A}(t)\|_{(A(t),\lambda(t))}\, dt \\ &\leq \sqrt{2}\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \|\dot{\Gamma}(t)\|_{\Gamma(t)}\, dt, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from the trivial lower bound which one may obtain from (3.3).

Assuming $\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \|\dot{\Gamma}(t)\|_{\Gamma(t)}\, dt \leq C_\varepsilon/\mu(\Gamma(t_k))$ we conclude

$$d_{\mathbb{P}^2}(\Gamma(t_{k+1}), (A(t_{k+1}), \lambda_k, v_k)) \leq \frac{(2+\sqrt{2})C_\varepsilon}{\mu(\Gamma(t_k))}.$$

Since $d_{\mathbb{P}^2}(\Gamma(t_k), \Gamma(t_{k+1})) < \frac{C_\varepsilon}{\mu(\Gamma(t_k))}$, from *Proposition 3.5* we get

$$d_{\mathbb{P}^2}(\Gamma(t_{k+1}), (A(t_{k+1}), \lambda_k, v_k)) \leq \frac{(1+\varepsilon)(2+\sqrt{2})C_\varepsilon}{\mu(\Gamma(t_{k+1}))}.$$

From *Proposition 4.2*, if $u := (1+\varepsilon)C_\varepsilon(2+\sqrt{2}) \leq \theta_0$, then

$$\begin{aligned} &d_{\mathbb{P}^2}(N(A(t_{k+1}), \lambda_k, v_k)), \Gamma(t_{k+1})) \leq \\ &\leq \quad R_u\, \beta_{u\, R_u} \left(\frac{2\tan(u\, R_u)}{1-\sqrt{2}\, u\, R_u}\right) \frac{1}{2} \cdot d_{\mathbb{P}^2}(\Gamma(t_{k+1}), (A(t_{k+1}), \lambda_k, v_k)) \\ &\leq \quad \frac{R_u\, \beta_{u\, R_u} \left(\frac{2\tan(u\, R_u)}{1-\sqrt{2}\, u\, R_u}\right) \frac{1}{2}\, u}{\mu(\Gamma(t_{k+1}))}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, if ε is small enough such that $u \leq \theta_0$ and $R_u\, \beta_{u\, R_u} \left(\frac{2\tan(u\, R_u)}{1-\sqrt{2}\, u\, R_u}\right) \frac{1}{2}\, u < C_\varepsilon$, we get that $\hat{\Gamma}(t_{k+1})$ is an approximate solution of the eigenvalue problem $\Gamma(t_{k+1})$. Then, the proof of *Theorem 2* can be deduced applying *Proposition 5.1* to the ε selected before. □

Remark 5.1. One can take $\varepsilon = 0.2448$. Then, $C_\varepsilon \approx 0.010383$, and one can choose $C = 120$.

6. Appendix

This section is divided in two parts. In the first one we include a proof of *Proposition 4.1.* In the second part we prove *Lemma 4.2.*

6.1. **Proof of Proposition 4.1.** Throughout this subsection, when ever we fix a representative of $(A, \lambda, v) \in \mathcal{W}$ such that $\|A\|_F = 1$ and $\|v\| = 1$, we will consider the canonical Hermitian structure on $\mathbb{K} \times \mathbb{K}^n$.

6.1.1. *Preliminaries and Technical Lemmas.*

Lemma 6.1. *Let $(A,\lambda,v) \in \mathcal{W}$ and $v' \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^n)$ such that $d_{\mathbb{P}}(v,v') < \pi/2$.*
1) Let $\Pi_{v^\perp}|_{v'^\perp} : v'^\perp \to v^\perp$ be the restriction of the orthogonal projection $\Pi_{v^\perp}$ of $\mathbb{K}^n$ onto $v'^\perp$. Then,

$$\|\,(\Pi_{v^\perp}|_{v'^\perp})^{-1}\,\| = \frac{1}{\cos(d_{\mathbb{P}}(v,v'))}.$$

2) Pick a representative of $(A,\lambda,v) \in \mathcal{W}$ such that $\|A\|_F = 1$ and $\|v\| = 1$. Then,

(i)

$$\|\,\big(DF_A(\lambda,v)|_{\mathbb{K}\times v'^\perp}\big)^{-1}\cdot DF_A(\lambda,v)|_{\mathbb{K}\times v^\perp}\,\| = \frac{1}{\cos(d_{\mathbb{P}}(v,v'))};$$

(ii)

$$\|\,\big(DF_A(\lambda,v)|_{\mathbb{K}\times v'^\perp}\big)^{-1}\,\| \le \frac{\|\,(DF_A(\lambda,v)|_{\mathbb{K}\times v^\perp})^{-1}\,\|}{\cos(d_{\mathbb{P}}(v,v'))}.$$

Remark 6.1. In part 2) and 3) of the preceding lemma, we consider the spaces $\mathbb{K}\times v^\perp$ and $\mathbb{K}\times v'^\perp$ as subspaces of $\mathbb{K}\times\mathbb{K}^n$ with the canonical Hermitian structure.

Proof. 1): Follows by elementary computations.
2)- (i): For $(\dot\lambda,\dot v) \in \mathbb{K}\times v^\perp$, let $(\dot\eta,\dot w) \in \mathbb{K}\times v'^\perp$ such that

$$\big(\dot\eta,\dot w\big) = \big(DF_A(\lambda,v)|_{\mathbb{K}\times v'^\perp}\big)^{-1}\cdot DF_A(\lambda,v)|_{\mathbb{K}\times v^\perp}(\dot\lambda,\dot v).$$

Then,

$$\dot\eta v + (\lambda I_n - A)\dot w = \dot\lambda v + (\lambda I_n - A)\dot v.$$

Since $(A,\lambda,v) \in \mathcal{W}$, we deduce that $\dot\eta = \dot\lambda$ and $\Pi_{v^\perp}\dot w = \dot v$. Then, we conclude that

$$\big(DF_A(\lambda,v)|_{\mathbb{K}\times v'^\perp}\big)^{-1}\cdot DF_A(\lambda,v)|_{\mathbb{K}\times v^\perp}(\dot\lambda,\dot v) = \big(\dot\lambda,(\Pi_{v^\perp}|_{v'^\perp})^{-1}(\dot v)\big).$$

Taking norms, and maximizing on the unit sphere in $\mathbb{K}\times v^\perp$, (i) follows from 1).
2)-(ii): Note that

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\,\big(DF_A(\lambda,v)|_{\mathbb{K}\times v'^\perp}\big)^{-1}\,\| \le \\ &\qquad \|\,\big(DF_A(\lambda,v)|_{\mathbb{K}\times v'^\perp}\big)^{-1}\cdot DF_A(\lambda,v)|_{\mathbb{K}\times v^\perp}\,\|\cdot\|\,(DF_A(\lambda,v)|_{\mathbb{K}\times v^\perp})^{-1}\,\|,\end{aligned}$$

then apply 2)-(i). □

Lemma 6.2. *Let $(A,\lambda,v) \in \mathbb{K}^{n\times n}\times\mathbb{K}\times\mathbb{K}^n$ such that $\|A\|_F = 1$ and $\|v\| = 1$, then $\|D^2F_A(\lambda,v)\| \le 1$.*

Proof. Differentiating two times F_A, we get

$$D^2F_A(\lambda,v)(\dot\lambda,\dot w)(\dot\eta,\dot u) = \dot\lambda\dot u + \dot\eta\dot w, \qquad \text{for all} \quad (\dot\lambda,\dot w),\,(\dot\eta,\dot u) \in \mathbb{K}\times\mathbb{K}^n.$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}\|D^2F_A(\lambda,v)(\dot\lambda,\dot w)(\dot\eta,\dot u)\| &\le |\dot\lambda|\cdot\|\dot u\| + |\dot\eta|\cdot\|\dot w\| \\ &\le (|\dot\lambda|^2+\|\dot u\|^2)^{1/2}\cdot(|\dot\eta|^2+\|\dot w\|^2)^{1/2},\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from Cauchy-Schwarz. □

We recall the fairly known *Neumann Lemma* (or *Banach Lemma*):

Lemma 6.3 (Neumann Lemma)**.** *Let $\mathbb{E}$ be a Hermitian space, and $A, I_{\mathbb{E}} : \mathbb{E} \to \mathbb{E}$ be linear operators where $I_{\mathbb{E}}$ is the identity. If $\|A - I_{\mathbb{E}}\| < 1$, then A is invertible and*

$$\|A^{-1}\| \leq \frac{1}{1 - \|A - I_{\mathbb{E}}\|}.$$

Proposition 6.1. *Let $0 < u \leq 1/(2\sqrt{2})$.*
Let $(A, \lambda, v) \in \mathcal{W}$, such that $\|A\|_F = 1$, $\|v\| = 1$, and $(\lambda_0, v_0) \in \mathbb{K} \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^n)$. If

$$(|\lambda_0 - \lambda|^2 + d_T(v_0, v)^2)^{1/2} < \frac{u}{\left\| DF_A\,(\lambda, v)\,|_{\mathbb{K}\times v^\perp}{}^{-1} \right\|},$$

then the Newton sequence $(\lambda_k, v_k) := N_A^k(\lambda_0, v_0)$ satisfies

$$(|\lambda_k - \lambda|^2 + d_T(v_k, v)^2)^{1/2} \leq \sqrt{2} \cdot \delta(\sqrt{2}\,u) \cdot \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{2^k - 1} \cdot (|\lambda_0 - \lambda|^2 + d_T(v_0, v)^2)^{1/2},$$

for all $k > 0$, where $\delta(u) := u/(1-u)$.

Proof. Take a representative of v_0 such that $\langle v - v_0, v_0 \rangle = 0$. Note that $\|v_0\| \cdot d_T(v, v_0) = \|v - v_0\|$ and $\|v_0\| \leq 1$.

In particular, the hypothesis implies that

$$\|DF_A(\lambda, v)|_{\mathbb{K}\times v^\perp}{}^{-1}\| \cdot \|(\lambda_0 - \lambda, v_0 - v)\| < u.$$

Taylor's expansion of F_A and DF_A in a neighborhood of (λ, v) are given by

$$F_A(\lambda', v') = DF_A(\lambda, v)(\lambda' - \lambda, v' - v) + \frac{1}{2} \cdot D^2 F_A(\lambda, v)(\lambda' - \lambda, v' - v)^2, \tag{6.1}$$

and

$$DF_A(\lambda', v') = DF_A(\lambda, v) + D^2 F_A(\lambda, v)(\lambda' - \lambda, v' - v). \tag{6.2}$$

One has

$$\begin{aligned} &\Big(DF_A(\lambda, v)\big|_{\mathbb{K}\times v_0{}^\perp}\Big)^{-1} \cdot DF_A(\lambda_0, v_0)\big|_{\mathbb{K}\times v_0{}^\perp} - I_{\mathbb{K}\times v_0{}^\perp} = \\ &= \Big(DF_A(\lambda, v)\big|_{\mathbb{K}\times v_0{}^\perp}\Big)^{-1} \cdot \Big(DF_A(\lambda_0, v_0)\big|_{\mathbb{K}\times v_0{}^\perp} - DF_A(\lambda, v)\big|_{\mathbb{K}\times v_0{}^\perp}\Big) \\ &= \Big(DF_A(\lambda, v)\big|_{\mathbb{K}\times v_0{}^\perp}\Big)^{-1} \cdot D^2 F_A(\lambda, v))(\lambda_0 - \lambda, v_0 - v)\big|_{\mathbb{K}\times v_0{}^\perp}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, taking norms, we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\|\Big(DF_A(\lambda, v)\big|_{\mathbb{K}\times v_0{}^\perp}\Big)^{-1} \cdot DF_A(\lambda_0, v_0)\big|_{\mathbb{K}\times v_0{}^\perp} - I_{\mathbb{K}\times v_0{}^\perp}\right\| \leq \\ &\leq \left\|DF_A(\lambda, v)|_{\mathbb{K}\times v_0{}^\perp}{}^{-1}\right\| \cdot \left\|D^2 F_A(\lambda, v))(\lambda_0 - \lambda, v_0 - v)\right\| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\cos(d_{\mathbb{P}}(v, v_0))} \cdot \left\|DF_A(\lambda, v)|_{\mathbb{K}\times v^\perp}{}^{-1}\right\| \cdot \|(\lambda_0 - \lambda, v_0 - v)\|, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from *Lemma 6.1* and *Lemma 6.2*.
In the range of angles under consideration $\|v_0\| = \cos(d_{\mathbb{P}}(v, v_0)) \geq 1/\sqrt{2}$. Then, by

the condition $0 < u \leq 1/(2\sqrt{2})$ we can deduce from *Lemma 6.3* that $DF_A(\lambda_0, v_0)\big|_{\mathbb{K}\times {v_0}^\perp}$ is invertible and

$$\left\| \left(DF_A(\lambda_0, v_0)\big|_{\mathbb{K}\times {v_0}^\perp} \right)^{-1} \cdot DF_A(\lambda, v)\big|_{\mathbb{K}\times {v_0}^\perp} \right\| \leq \tag{6.3}$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{\cos(d_{\mathbb{P}}(v,v_0))} \cdot \left\| DF_A(\lambda, v)|_{\mathbb{K}\times v^\perp}{}^{-1} \right\| \cdot \|(\lambda_0 - \lambda, v_0 - v)\|}.$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} N_A(\lambda_0, v_0) &- (\lambda, v) \\ &= (\lambda_0 - \lambda, v_0 - v) - \left(DF_A(\lambda_0, v_0)\big|_{\mathbb{K}\times {v_0}^\perp} \right)^{-1} \cdot F_A(\lambda_0, v_0) \\ &= \left(DF_A(\lambda_0, v_0)\big|_{\mathbb{K}\times {v_0}^\perp} \right)^{-1} \cdot \\ &\qquad \cdot \left(DF_A(\lambda_0, v_0)\big|_{\mathbb{K}\times {v_0}^\perp} (\lambda_0 - \lambda, v_0 - v) - F_A(\lambda_0, v_0) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then, from (6.1) we get

$$\begin{aligned} N_A(\lambda_0, v_0) - (\lambda, v) &= \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \left(DF_A(\lambda_0, v_0)\big|_{\mathbb{K}\times {v_0}^\perp} \right)^{-1} \cdot D^2F_A(\lambda, v)(\lambda_0 - \lambda, v_0 - v)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the canonical norm in $\mathbb{K} \times \mathbb{K}^n$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\|N_A(\lambda_0, v_0) - (\lambda, v)\| \leq \\ &\quad \leq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \left\| DF_A(\lambda_0, v_0)|_{\mathbb{K}\times {v_0}^\perp}{}^{-1} \right\| \cdot \|D^2F_A(\lambda, v)(\lambda_0 - \lambda, v_0 - v)^2\|. \end{aligned}$$

Then, from (6.3) and *Lemma 6.1* we get

$$\|N_A(\lambda_0, v_0) - (\lambda, v)\| \leq \tag{6.4}$$

$$\leq \frac{\sqrt{2} \cdot \left\| DF_A(\lambda, v)|_{\mathbb{K}\times v^\perp}{}^{-1} \right\| \cdot \frac{1}{2} \cdot \|D^2F_A(\lambda, v)(\lambda_0 - \lambda, v_0 - v)^2\|.}{1 - \sqrt{2} \cdot \left\| DF_A(\lambda, v)|_{\mathbb{K}\times v^\perp}{}^{-1} \right\| \cdot \|(\lambda_0 - \lambda, v_0 - v)\|}$$

Therefore, from *Lemma 6.2*, yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\|N_A(\lambda_0, v_0) - (\lambda, v)\| \leq \\ &\leq \frac{\sqrt{2} \cdot \left\| DF_A(\lambda, v)|_{\mathbb{K}\times v^\perp}{}^{-1} \right\| \cdot \|(\lambda_0 - \lambda, v_0 - v)\|}{1 - \sqrt{2} \cdot \left\| DF_A(\lambda, v)|_{\mathbb{K}\times v^\perp}{}^{-1} \right\| \cdot \|(\lambda_0 - \lambda, v_0 - v)\|} \cdot \frac{1}{2} \|(\lambda_0 - \lambda, v_0 - v)\|. \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} &\|N_A(\lambda_0, v_0) - (\lambda, v)\| \leq \\ &\leq \frac{\sqrt{2} \cdot \left\| DF_A(\lambda, v)|_{\mathbb{K}\times v^\perp}{}^{-1} \right\| \cdot (|\lambda_0 - \lambda|^2 + d_T(v_0, v)^2)^{1/2}}{1 - \sqrt{2} \cdot \left\| DF_A(\lambda, v)|_{\mathbb{K}\times v^\perp}{}^{-1} \right\| \cdot (|\lambda_0 - \lambda|^2 + d_T(v_0, v)^2)^{1/2}} \cdot \\ &\qquad \cdot \frac{1}{2} (|\lambda_0 - \lambda|^2 + d_T(v_0, v)^2)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $(\lambda_1, v_1) := N_A(\lambda_0, v_0)$.

From the proof of *Lemma 6.2* we have $D^2F_A(\lambda, v)(\lambda_0 - \lambda, v_0 - v)^2 = 2(\lambda_0 - \lambda)(v_0 - v)$, then, from (6.4) one can deduce that $\|v_1 - v\| < \delta(\sqrt{2}\,u)\|v_0 - v\|$, where $\delta(u) = u/(1-u)$. Since $u \leq 1/(2\sqrt{2})$, we have $\delta(\sqrt{2}\,u) \leq 1$, then from *Lemma 2, (4)* of Blum et al. [4] (page 264) we get

$$d_T(v_1, v) \leq \frac{\|v_1 - v\|}{\|v_0\|} \leq \sqrt{2} \cdot \|v_1 - v\|.$$

Hence

$$(6.5) \quad (|\lambda_1 - \lambda|^2 + d_T(v_1, v)^2)^{1/2} \leq$$
$$\leq \frac{2 \cdot \left\| DF_A(\lambda, v)|_{\mathbb{K}\times v^\perp}{}^{-1} \right\| \cdot (|\lambda_0 - \lambda|^2 + d_T(v_0, v)^2)^{1/2}}{1 - \sqrt{2} \cdot \left\| DF_A(\lambda, v)|_{\mathbb{K}\times v^\perp}{}^{-1} \right\| \cdot (|\lambda_0 - \lambda|^2 + d_T(v_0, v)^2)^{1/2}} \cdot$$
$$\cdot \frac{1}{2} (|\lambda_0 - \lambda|^2 + d_T(v_0, v)^2)^{1/2}.$$

Therefore,

$$(6.6) \qquad (|\lambda_1 - \lambda|^2 + d_T(v_1, v)^2)^{1/2} \leq \sqrt{2} \cdot \delta(\sqrt{2}\,u) \cdot \frac{1}{2} (|\lambda_0 - \lambda|^2 + d_T(v_0, v)^2)^{1/2}.$$

From (6.6), (6.5), and the fact that $\delta(\sqrt{2}\,u) \leq 1$, working by induction we get

$$(|\lambda_k - \lambda|^2 + d_T(v_k, v)^2)^{1/2} \leq \sqrt{2} \cdot \delta(\sqrt{2}\,u) \cdot \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{2^k - 1} \cdot (|\lambda_0 - \lambda|^2 + d_T(v_0, v)^2)^{1/2},$$

for all $k > 0$, where $(\lambda_k, v_k) := N_A^k(\lambda_0, v_0)$. ☐

Proposition 6.2. *Let $(A, \lambda, v) \in \mathcal{W}$, such that $\|A\|_F = 1$ and $\|v\| = 1$. Then,*

$$\mu(A, \lambda, v) \leq \|DF_A\,(\lambda, v)\,|_{\mathbb{K}\times v^\perp}{}^{-1}\| \leq 2 \cdot \mu(A, \lambda, v).$$

Proof. Since the action of $\mathbb{U}_n(\mathbb{K})$ on $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^n)$ is transitive, we may assume that $v = (1, 0, \ldots, 0)^T$. Then, completing to a basis of $\mathbb{K} \times v^\perp$, we have that

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda & w \\ 0 & \hat{A} \end{pmatrix}, \quad DF_A(\lambda, v)|_{\mathbb{K}\times v^\perp} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -w \\ 0 & \Pi_{v^\perp}(\lambda I_n - A)|_{v^\perp} \end{pmatrix},$$

where $w \in \mathbb{K}^{1\times(n-1)}$.
Note that $(DF_A(\lambda, v)|_{\mathbb{K}\times v^\perp})^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & w(\Pi_{v^\perp}(\lambda I_n - A)|_{v^\perp})^{-1} \\ 0 & (\Pi_{v^\perp}(\lambda I_n - A)|_{v^\perp})^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$. Hence

$$\|DF_A\,(\lambda, v)\,|_{\mathbb{K}\times v^\perp}{}^{-1}\| \geq \max\{1, \|(\Pi_{v^\perp}(\lambda I_n - A)|_{v^\perp})^{-1}\|\} = \mu(A, \lambda, v).$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|DF_A\,(\lambda, v)\,|_{\mathbb{K}\times v^\perp}{}^{-1}\| \leq \\
\leq\ & \left\| \begin{pmatrix} 1 & w(\Pi_{v^\perp}(\lambda I_n - A)|_{v^\perp})^{-1} \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\| + \left\| \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & (\Pi_{v^\perp}(\lambda I_n - A)|_{v^\perp})^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \right\| \\
\leq\ & \max\{1, \|w(\Pi_{v^\perp}(\lambda I_n - A)|_{v^\perp})^{-1}\|\} + \|(\Pi_{v^\perp}(\lambda I_n - A)|_{v^\perp})^{-1}\| \\
\leq\ & 2 \cdot \mu(A, \lambda, v).
\end{aligned}$$

☐

6.1.2. *Proof of Proposition 4.1.*

Proof of Proposition 4.1. The proof follows directly from *Proposition 6.1*, *Proposition 6.2* and *Lemma 3.5*. □

6.2. **Proof of Lemma 4.2.**

Lemma 6.4. *Let $A \in \mathbb{K}^{n\times n}$, $A \neq 0_n$, such that $\|A\|_F = 1$. Let λ, $\lambda' \in \mathbb{K}$ such that $|\lambda| \leq 1$.*

1. *If $|\lambda' - \lambda| \leq c$ for some $0 \leq c < \sqrt{2}$, then, there exists $\beta_c > 1$ such that*
$$d_{\mathbb{P}}((A,\lambda),(A,\lambda)) \leq \beta_c \cdot |\lambda' - \lambda|.$$
One may choose $\beta_c = (1 - c^2/2)^{-1/2}$.
2. *If $d_{\mathbb{P}}((A,\lambda),(A,\lambda')) \leq \hat{\theta}$ for some $0 \leq \hat{\theta} < \pi/4$, then, there exist $R_\theta > 1$ such that*
$$|\lambda' - \lambda| \leq R_{\hat{\theta}} \cdot d_{\mathbb{P}}((A,\lambda),(A,\lambda')).$$
One may choose $R_{\hat{\theta}} = [\sqrt{2}/\cos(\hat{\theta} + \pi/4)^3]^{1/2}$.

Proof. Let $\theta := d_{\mathbb{P}}((A,\lambda),(A,\lambda'))$. By the law of cosines we know that

$$|\lambda - \lambda'|^2 = 1 + |\lambda|^2 + 1 + |\lambda'|^2 - 2\cdot\sqrt{1+|\lambda|^2}\cdot\sqrt{1+|\lambda'|^2}\cdot\cos\theta.$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} |\lambda - \lambda'|^2 &= \left(\sqrt{1+|\lambda|^2} - \sqrt{1+|\lambda'|^2}\right)^2 + \\ &\quad +2\cdot\sqrt{1+|\lambda|^2}\cdot\sqrt{1+|\lambda|^2}\cdot(1-\cos\theta). \end{aligned} \tag{6.7}$$

From (6.7) we get that

$$|\lambda - \lambda'|^2 \geq 2\cdot\sqrt{1+|\lambda|^2}\cdot\sqrt{1+|\lambda|^2}\cdot(1-\cos\theta),$$

i.e.

$$1 - \cos\theta \leq \frac{|\lambda - \lambda'|^2}{2\cdot\sqrt{1+|\lambda|^2}\cdot\sqrt{1+|\lambda|^2}} \leq \frac{|\lambda' - \lambda|^2}{2}. \tag{6.8}$$

Therefore, $1-\cos\theta \leq \frac{c^2}{2}$, and hence the angle θ is bounded above by $\arccos(1 - c^2/2)$. By the Taylor expansion of cosine near 0 we get the bound

$$\theta^2 \leq \frac{2}{1 - c^2/2}\cdot(1-\cos\theta).$$

Then, from (6.8) we can deduce the upper bound in (1).

For the lower bound in (2), we rewrite the cosine law and we get:

$$\begin{aligned} |\lambda - \lambda'|^2 &= \left(\frac{|\lambda|^2 - |\lambda'|^2}{\sqrt{1+|\lambda|^2} + \sqrt{1+|\lambda'|^2}}\right)^2 + \\ &\qquad +2\sqrt{1+|\lambda|^2}\cdot\sqrt{1+|\lambda'|^2}\cdot(1-\cos\theta). \end{aligned}$$

Since $||\lambda| - |\lambda'|| \leq |\lambda - \lambda'|$ and $1 - \cos\theta \leq \theta^2/2$, then,

$$\begin{aligned} |\lambda - \lambda'|^2 \leq \left(\frac{|\lambda| + |\lambda'|}{\sqrt{1+|\lambda|^2} + \sqrt{1+|\lambda'|^2}}\right)^2 \cdot |\lambda - \lambda'|^2 + \\ +\sqrt{1+|\lambda|^2}\cdot\sqrt{1+|\lambda'|^2}\cdot\theta^2 \end{aligned} \tag{6.9}$$

Since $0 \leq |\lambda| \leq 1$, is easy to see that

$$\frac{|\lambda| + |\lambda'|}{\sqrt{1+|\lambda|^2} + \sqrt{1+|\lambda'|^2}} \leq \frac{1+|\lambda'|}{\sqrt{2} + \sqrt{1+|\lambda'|^2}}.$$

Moreover, by elementary arguments one can see that $|\lambda'| \leq \tan(\hat{\theta} + \pi/4)$, and therefore one can get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|\lambda| + |\lambda'|}{\sqrt{1+|\lambda|^2} + \sqrt{1+|\lambda'|^2}} &\leq \frac{1+\tan(\hat{\theta}+\pi/4)}{\sqrt{2} + \sqrt{1+\tan(\hat{\theta}+\pi/4)^2}} \\ &\leq \frac{\tan(\hat{\theta}+\pi/4)}{\sqrt{1+\tan(\hat{\theta}+\pi/4)^2}} = \sin(\hat{\theta}+\pi/4). \end{aligned}$$

Then, from (6.9),

$$|\lambda - \lambda'|^2 \leq \frac{\sqrt{1+|\lambda|^2} \cdot \sqrt{1+|\lambda'|^2}}{\cos(\hat{\theta}+\pi/4)^2} \cdot \theta^2,$$

and hence

$$|\lambda - \lambda'|^2 \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\cos(\hat{\theta}+\pi/4)^3} \cdot \theta^2.$$

□

Remark 6.2. Note that if $(A, \lambda) \in \pi_1(\mathcal{V}) \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^{n\times n} \times \mathbb{K})$ then $|\lambda| \leq \|A\|_F$ is always satisfied.

6.2.1. *Proof of Lemma 4.2.*

Proof of Lemma 4.2. The proof of (1) and (2) follows directly from de definition of $d_{\mathbb{P}^2}$ and *Lemma 6.4.* □

Acknowledgments. The author is very grateful to Carlos Beltrán, Jean-Pierre Dedieu and Michael Shub for many useful discussions, and for helped to improve the presentation of this paper. The author also would like to thanks Felipe Cucker and Teresa Krick. Part of this work was elaborated during the special semester on Foundation of Computational Mathematics in 2009, in the Fields Institute of Toronto. The author also thanks the Fields Institute for hospitality and financial support.
This paper was partially support by CSIC.

References

[1] S. Batterson and J. Smillie: Rayleigh quotient iteration fails for nonsymmetric matrices, *Applied Math. Letters*, 2 (1989) 19-20.
[2] S. Batterson and J. Smillie: Rayleigh quotient iteration for nonsymmetric matrices, *Math. of Comp.*, 191 (1990) 169-178.
[3] C. Beltrán: A continuation method to solve polynomial systems, and its complexity, *Numerische Mathematik* 117, no. 1 (2011), 89113.
[4] L. Blum, F. Cucker, M. Shub and S. Smale: Complexity and real computation. *Springer-Verlag*, New York, 1998.
[5] P. Bürguisser and F. Cucker: On a problem posed by Steve Smale. To appear in *Annals of Mathematics.*
[6] C. D'Andrea, T. Krick and M. Sombra: Heights of varieties in multiprojective spaces and arithmetic Nullstellensätze. Preprint 2011.

[7] J.P. Dedieu: Points Fixes, Zéros et la Méthode de Newton. Mathématiques & Applications *SMAI-Springer Verlag* , 54, 2006.

[8] J-P. Dedieu, G. Malajovich and M. Shub: Adaptative step size selection for homotopy methods to solve polynomial equations, to appear.

[9] J.P. Dedieu and M. Shub: Multihomogeneous Newton Methods. *Mathematics Of Computation* vol. 69, no. 231, (1999), 1071-1098.

[10] P. Deift: Some open problems in random matrix theory and the theory of integrable systems. *Contemporary Mathematics*, 458 (2008), 419-430.

[11] J. Demmel: The Probability that a numerical analysis problem is difficult. *Mathematics Of Computation* vol. 50,(1988), 449-480.

[12] W. Fulton: Intersection Theory. Springer Verlag, 1984.

[13] G. Golub and C. van Loan: Matrix Computations, third edition, *The Johns Hopkins University Press*, 1996.

[14] T.Y. Li: Numerical solution of multivariate polynomial systems by homotopy continuation methods. *Acta numerica*, 6, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge,(1997), 399436.

[15] D. Mumford: Algebraic Geometry I Complex Projective Varieties. Springer-Verlag, 1976.

[16] M. Shub: Complexity of Bezout's theorem. VI. Geodesics in the Condition (Number) Metric. *Foundation of Computational Mathematics.* 9, (2009), 171-178.

[17] M. Shub and S. Smale: Complexity of Bezout's theorem. I. Geometrical Aspects. *J. Am. Math. Soc.* vol. 6 , no. 1, (1993), 459-501.

[18] M. Shub and S. Smale: Complexity of Bezout's theorem. IV. Probability of success; extensions. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* 33 , no. 1, (1996),128-148.

[19] G.W. Stewart:Matrix Algorithms: Eigensystems, *SIAM*, 2001.

[20] G.W. Stewart and J. Sun : Matrix perturbation theory. *Academic Press*, 1990.

[21] D. S. Watkins: The Matrix Eigenvalue Problem. GR and Krylov Subspaces Methods. *SIAM*, 2007.

[22] J.H. Wilkinson: The Algebraic Eigenvalue Problem, *Clarendon Press, Oxford*, 1965.

[23] J.H. Wilkinson: Note on matrices with a very ill-conditioned eigenproblem. *Numeri. Math.*, vol 19, (1972), 176-178.

FACULTAD DE CIENCIAS, UNIVERSIDAD DE LA REPÚBLICA, IGUÁ 4225, 11400 MONTEVIDEO, URUGUAY

E-mail address: `diego@cmat.edu.uy`